

LYCO OF TROAS AND HIERONYMUS OF RHODES

Text, Translation, and Discussion

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY STUDIES
IN CLASSICAL HUMANITIES

Volume XII

Edited by _____

WILLIAM W. FORTENBAUGH
STEPHEN A. WHITE

LYCO OF TROAS
AND
HIERONYMUS
OF RHODES

**Rutgers University Studies
in Classical Humanities**

Series Editor: William W. Fortenbaugh

Advisory Board: Dimitri Gutas
Pamela M. Huby
David C. Mirhady
Kirk R. Sanders
Eckart Schütrumpf
Robert W. Sharples

On Stoic and Peripatetic Ethics: The Work of Arius Didymus,
volume I

Theophrastus of Eresus: On His Life and Work, volume II

*Theophrastean Studies: On Natural Science, Physics and Metaphysics,
Ethics, Religion and Rhetoric,* volume III

Cicero's Knowledge of the Peripatos, volume IV

*Theophrastus: His Psychological, Doxographical, and Scientific
Writings,* volume V

Peripatetic Rhetoric After Aristotle, volume VI

*The Passionate Intellect: Essays on the Transformation of Classical
Traditions presented to Professor I.G. Kidd,* volume VII

Theophrastus: Reappraising the Sources, volume VIII

Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion, volume IX

Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation and Discussion, volume X

Eudemus of Rhodes, volume XI

*Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes: Text, Translation and Discus-
sion,* volume XII

LYCO OF TROAS AND HIERONYMUS OF RHODES

Text, Translation, and Discussion

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY STUDIES
IN CLASSICAL HUMANITIES

Volume XII

Edited by

WILLIAM W. FORTENBAUGH
STEPHEN A. WHITE

First published 2004 by Transaction Publishers

Published 2017 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor and Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 2004 by Taylor & Francis.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 2004046037

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes : text, translation, and discussion /
edited by William W. Fortenbaugh, Stephen A. White.

p. cm. — (Rutgers University studies in classical humanities ; v. 12)

Includes Greek and Latin texts with English translation.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-7658-0253-8 (alk. paper)

1. Lyco, of Troas. 2. Hieronymus, of Rhodes. I. Fortenbaugh,
William W. II. White, Stephen A. (Stephen Augustus) III. Series.

B577.L84L83 2004

185—dc22

2004046037

ISSN: 0732-9814

ISBN 13: 978-0-7658-0253-8 (hbk)

Dedicated with thanks to
Irving Louis Horowitz
for his trust and encouragement
over twenty years

Contents

Preface	ix
Contributors	xi
1. Lyco of Troas: The Sources, Text and Translation <i>Peter Stork</i>	1–78
2. Hieronymus of Rhodes: The Sources, Text and Translation <i>Stephen White</i>	79–276
3. The Life of Lyco and the Life of the Lyceum <i>Jørgen Mejer</i>	277–287
4. Hieronymus in Athens and Rhodes <i>Elisabetta Matelli</i>	289–314
5. Peripatetic Philosophers as Wandering Scholars: Some Historical Remarks on the Socio-Political Conditions of Philosophizing in the Third Century BCE <i>Peter Scholz</i>	315–353
6. Third-Century Peripatetics on Vision <i>Todd Stuart Ganson</i>	355–362
7. The Historical Setting of Hieronymus fr. 10 White (= fr. 53 Wehrli) <i>Peter Lautner</i>	363–374
8. Peripatetic Reactions to Hellenistic Epistemology <i>Hans B. Gottschalk</i>	375–388
9. Lyco and Hieronymus on the Good Life <i>Stephen White</i>	389–409

10. Lyco φραστικός: Comments on Ten Texts <i>William W. Fortenbaugh</i>	411–441
11. Hieronymus on Isocrates' Style <i>David C. Mirhady</i>	443–456
12. Hieronymus ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου <i>Andrea Martano</i>	457–474
Appendix of Visual Material	475–480
Index of Ancient Sources for Chapters 3–12	481–494

Preface

This volume is the twelfth in the series Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities = RUSCH. Most of the early volumes in the series were devoted to Theophrastus, Aristotle's pupil and successor as head of the Peripatos. With volume 9 the focus shifted to other Peripatetic philosophers. Demetrius of Phalerum was the subject of volume 9, Dicaearchus of Messana the subject of volume 10, and Eudemus of Rhodes the subject of volume 11. Now in volume 12, we turn our attention to two later Peripatetics, Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes. Like Volumes 9 and 10, the present volume collects the ancient texts in which Lyco and Hieronymus are named. Each text is provided with a critical apparatus of variant readings, an English translation, and occasional notes. The edition-translation of Lyco is largely the work of Peter Stork; that of Hieronymus is exclusively the work of Stephen White. Major problems concerning the two Peripatetics are discussed in original essays by ten scholars representing six different countries. It is expected that this volume will largely replace the editions of Lyco and Hieronymus that were prepared by Fritz Wehrli and published in volume 6 (2nd ed. 1968) and 10 (2nd ed. 1969) of *Die Schule des Aristoteles*.

The essays are revised (often heavily revised) versions of papers presented at a conference on The Early Hellenistic Lyceum held at the University of Texas at Austin on March 29-31, 2001. The University's College of Liberal Arts and Department of Classics were enthusiastic and generous hosts; we gladly thank them for their support, and especially Professor Cynthia Shelmerdine, Chair of Classics. We also thank the Antikensammlung of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, for granting permission to publish new photographs of the Hieronymus epitaph (inv. Sk 1888). And we warmly thank Diane Smith for preparing camera-ready copy.

At the time of writing this preface, the RUSCH series is twenty years old, volume 1 having appeared in 1983. We have, then, a twenty year anniversary which is an occasion to reflect on the many persons, some now deceased, who helped RUSCH come into being. Gene Young, a member of the Rutgers Administration deserves pride of place. For it was his idea to jump-start work on the post-Aristotelian Peripatos by

seeking funding both from within and from outside Rutgers University. Two members of the Rutgers Research Council, David Cayer and David Pramer, should be mentioned next. For they recognized the importance of work on Peripatetic philosophy after Aristotle, secured internal funding and assisted in a successful effort to secure additional funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities. There followed a series of conferences, whose proceedings became the basis of the RUSCH series. Permission to use the name Rutgers in the title of the series (a unique honor then and now) was granted by Jean Parrish, Associate Provost of the University. To all these people we owe our thanks, and especially to that person who agreed to publish RUSCH. He is Irving Horowitz, Chairman of the Board and Editorial Director of Transaction Publishers. He deemed our work important and made us part of the Transaction family. To him we dedicate this volume.

WWF & SAW
November 2003

Contributors

Tiziano DORANDI, CNRS, UPR 76, 7, rue G. Moquet, BP 8, F-94801 Villejuif cedex, France

William W. FORTENBAUGH, Department of Classics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1414, USA

Todd Stuart GANSON, Philosophy Department, King Hall, Oberlin College, Oberlin, OH 44074, USA

Hans B. GOTTSCHALK, School of Classics, University of Leeds, Leeds LS 2 9JT, UK

Peter LAUTNER, Department of Philosophy, Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Egyetem utca 1, H-2087 Piliscsaba-Klotildliget, Hungary

Andrea MARTANO, Istituto di Filologia Classica e di Papirologia, Università Cattolica, Largo Gemelli 1, 20123 Milano, Italy

Elisabetta MATELLI, Istituto di Filologia Classica e di Papirologia, Università Cattolica, Largo Gemelli 1, 20123 Milano, Italy

Jørgen MEJER, Danish Institute in Athens, Herefondos 14, 10558 Athens, Greece

David C. MIRHADY, Humanities, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby BC V5A 1S6, Canada

Jan Max VAN OPHUIJSEN, Department of Philosophy, University of Utrecht, P.O. Box 80126, NL-3508 TC Utrecht, The Netherlands

Peter SCHOLZ, Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, Senckenberganlage 31, Postfach 11 19 32, D - 60054 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Peter STORK, Department of Classics, Leiden University, P.O. Box 9515, NL-2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

Stephen WHITE, Department of Classics, University of Texas at Austin, 1 University Station C3400, Austin, TX 78712-0308, USA

1

Lyco of Troas The Sources, Text and Translation

*Peter Stork, William W. Fortenbaugh
Tiziano Dorandi, Johannes M. van Ophuijsen*

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS USED	7
TEXTS	
I. Life 1–8	16
II. Writings	
Ethics 9–10	44
Rhetoric 11–12	48
Of uncertain provenance 13	52
III. Dubious 14–15	54
IV. Sayings 16–22	58
V. Named in a title 23	66
CONCORDANCE	68
INDEX OF LYCONIAN TEXTS	69
INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED	72
INDEX OF NAMES	75

INTRODUCTION

The present edition of the fragments of Lyc0 of Troas is modeled on that of the fragments of Demetrius of Phalerum in RUSCH vol. IX.

The texts are divided into five sections: I. texts concerning the *Life* of Lyc0 (1–8); II. texts concerning the *Writings* attributed to Lyc0 (9–13); III. texts of which the attribution to Lyc0 is considered *Dubious* by the editors (14–15); IV. texts containing *Sayings* attributed to Lyc0 (16–22); V. a text in which Lyc0 is named in the *title* of a work (23). Most of the texts are what traditionally are called *testimonia* rather than *fragmenta*.

The material is not large enough to admit of any extensive subdivision of the five sections. Only in the case of the texts concerning the *Writings* (II), the texts have been subdivided according to their subject matter under the headings *Ethics*, *Rhetoric* and *Of uncertain Provenance*. The *Sayings* attributed to Lyc0 have been collected as a separate group (IV), placed after sections I–III. This is the only section which contains some new material (17–22) as compared with Wehrli's edition. This new material, however, is quite problematic. In most cases, the attribution to Lyc0 is uncertain to say the least, and in three of the six sayings the attribution is to Glyco instead of Lyc0, though the variation can be explained without declaring the sayings spurious. The editors have not tried to make any decision as to the plausibility of the attribution; they hope that the full *apparatus* and notes to the translation will enable the users to judge for themselves. Moreover, in this volume William W. Fortenbaugh provides a thorough discussion of the sayings attributed to Lyc0 or Glyco.

The texts are numbered from 1 to 23. In one case (3A–3B) a number covers two texts which are distinguished by the letters A-B. These texts refer to the same specific subject matter (in that sense they are *parallel texts*), but the information supplied by these texts differs significantly enough to quote them in full.

In editing the texts, the editors have taken as their starting-point the text of an existing recent edition (mentioned in the heading of the text with line numbers of the edition used). This does not, however, mean that the text printed here is always identical to that of the edition mentioned in the heading. The editors have felt free to make changes in the text. These changes are accounted for in the lower critical ap-

paratus, and reflect our editorial policy. In the case of an edition of fragments, problems relating to the constitution of the text ought to be made perfectly clear to the user and not to be glossed over in order to effect an 'easy' reading.

The *texts* as printed in this edition are based upon the information supplied in the editions used and no original research on the *paradosis* has been done by the editors, with the following exception. The texts from Diogenes Laertius (1, 4) are based upon collations made by Tiziano Dorandi in preparing a new edition of the *Vitae Philosophorum*. In the case of the *Sayings*, the edition of the texts is made difficult by the absence of a modern and easily accessible edition of the *Corpus Parisinum*, which often is the earliest known source. In most cases, however, sayings of the *Corpus Parisinum* have found their way into the *Commonplaces*, which go under the name of Maximus Confessor. As the *Commonplaces* have quite recently been edited in an exemplary manner by Sibylle Ihm (with full references to sources and parallel texts), the text of her edition has been taken as the basis for the text of the sayings in the present edition. For the convenience of the user, references to the edition of Combefis in the *Patrologia Graeca* are added.

References to the corresponding *testimonia* and *fragmenta* in Wehrli's edition are given in the left margin of the Greek text at the line where Wehrli's fragment begins. The *upper apparatus* of parallel texts makes reference to all parallel texts in the strict sense which explicitly mention Lyco of Troas (the line numbers of the edition used are always added in these cases), and also to parallel texts in a wider sense which, without referring to Lyco, contain information that seems particularly relevant to the interpretation of the text (the passage or text is merely cited in these cases and often introduced by means of *cf.*). In addition, references are given to modern editions or collections of fragments of authors mentioned in the text. Finally, there are cross-references by means of numbers in bold type to other texts in the present collection in order to assist the user in collecting information.

The *lower* or *critical apparatus* is based upon the critical apparatus of the edition used for the text. It is selective and aims at supplying information specially relevant to the user of this edition. As a rule it is fuller than that found in the edition of Wehrli.

The *translation* tries to effect the impossible in being readable and at the same time as close to the original as possible.

The *notes to the translation* serve two purposes. First, they may supply (often quite basic) information which will assist the user in understanding and interpreting the text or, particularly in the case of the ‘historical’ testimonia, in placing it in its historical context. Second, they place the text within the wider context of the work from which it has been taken. Although the notes are not intended as a full commentary, they are fuller than they would be if the editors were planning to add a companion volume containing a commentary.

Tables of *Abbreviations* and of *Editions Used* have been provided. All abbreviations not found in these tables are those of *LSJ*. The *Concordance* relates the texts in this edition to that of Wehrli (1968). The *Index of Lyconian Texts* lists all Lyconian texts in the strict sense of the word, i.e. all texts explicitly mentioning Lyco of Troas, printed here as a text (indicated by means of numbers in bold type) or entered in a list, and all parallel texts in the strict sense, i.e. all parallel texts explicitly mentioning Lyco of Troas, entered in the upper apparatus. All other passages cited in the upper (or lower) apparatus and in the notes to the translation are listed in the *Index of Passages Cited*. Finally, the *Index of Names* to the translation may help the user in finding his way through the fragments more quickly.

A first version of this edition was prepared by the team of editors, consisting of Peter Stork, William W. Fortenbaugh, Tiziano Dorandi, and Johannes M. van Ophuijsen, for the Eleventh Conference of the Project Theophrastus, which was hosted by Stephen A. White, at the University of Texas at Austin, March 29–31, 2001.

The editors have benefitted from the assistance of a number of colleagues. François Lefèvre of the Université Paris I generously put at our disposal the text of his edition of the inscription from Delphi (6) in the *Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes* IV and has also kindly checked the text of the edition of the inscription in this volume. Hans Gottschalk of the University of Leeds has helped in clarifying the problems that are posed by (the text of) Lyco’s testament in the *Life of Lyco* by Diogenes Laertius. In his wisdom he foresaw that without more information satisfactory solutions are hardly to be arrived at, and unfortunately time has proved him right, for this edition at least. Dennis Searby of the University of Uppsala has considerably light(en)ed our path through the dark maze of ‘gnomology’. That the result is a daunting amount of annotation is not his fault. His acute explanation of the manner in which

6 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

mistakes of attribution are likely to be made is reflected in the notes to the translation of these sayings.

Work on this edition has been facilitated by the use of the CD ROM disks #D and #E of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* and the CD ROM disks #5.3 (Latin Texts) and #7 (Inscriptions & Papyri) of the Packard Institute. In the final stage, work on the edition by Peter Stork was made possible through a grant of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).

In recognition of their close collaboration, the editors would very much appreciate the present edition being referred to by means of the abbreviation 'SFOD'.

ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS USED

The list under (a) explains the abbreviations used in this collection to refer to standard collections and scholarly journals; that under (b) lists the text editions used for this collection; that under (c) explains other abbreviations used; and that under (d) explains the symbols used in the apparatus of this collection.

(a) Names, Standard Collections, Scholarly Journals, etc.

<i>AB</i>	<i>Anecdota Graeca</i> ed. I. Bekker. Vol. 3. Berlin 1821
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
<i>AP</i>	<i>Anthologia Palatina</i>
<i>BASP</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique</i>
Brink	K.O. Brink, 'Peripatos', <i>RE</i> Supplementband 7 (1940) 899–949
Bruns 1880	C.G. Bruns, 'Die Testamente der griechischen Philosophen', <i>Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte</i> 1, Romanistische Abtlg. (1880) 1–52 (= <i>Kleinere Schriften</i> 2, Weimar 1882, 192–237)
<i>BT</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana</i> . Leipzig B.G. Teubner
Capelle	W. Capelle, 'Lykon', <i>RE</i> 13 (1927) 2303–2308 no. 14
<i>CB</i>	<i>Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé</i> . Paris Les Belles Lettres
<i>CGF</i>	<i>Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> ed. G. Kaibel. Vol. 1.1 Berlin ² 1954 (1899)
<i>CID</i>	<i>Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes</i>
Dareste 1882	R. Dareste, 'Les testaments des philosophes grecs', <i>Annuaire de l'Association pour l'encouragement des études grecques en France</i> 16 (1882) 1–21
<i>DK</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> edd. H. Diels, W. Kranz. 3 vols. Berlin ⁶ 1951–2
<i>FD II</i>	<i>Fouilles de Delphes</i> , Tome II <i>Topographie et Architecture</i> . <i>Le Trésor de Cyrène</i> ed. J. Bousquet. Paris 1952
<i>FD III 1</i>	<i>Fouilles de Delphes</i> , Tome III <i>Épigraphie</i> , Fasc. 1 <i>Inscriptions de l'entrée du sanctuaire au trésor des Athéniens</i> ed. É. Bourguet. Paris 1929
<i>FD III 3</i>	<i>Fouilles de Delphes</i> , Tome III <i>Épigraphie</i> , Fasc. 3 <i>Inscriptions depuis le trésor des Athéniens jusqu'aux bases de Gélon</i> edd. G. Daux et A. Salac. Paris 1932

8 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

<i>FGrH</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> ed. F. Jacoby. Leiden 1926–58
<i>FHS&G</i>	<i>Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence</i> edd. W.W. Fortenbaugh, P.M. Huby, R.W. Sharples, D. Gutas. 2 vols. Leiden 1992
<i>GCS</i>	<i>Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte</i>
<i>GG</i>	<i>Grammatici Graeci</i>
<i>GGA</i>	<i>Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen</i>
Glucker, <i>Antiochus</i>	J. Glucker, <i>Antiochus and the Late Academy</i> . Göttingen 1978
Gottschalk 1972	H.B. Gottschalk, 'Notes on the Wills of the Peripatetic Scholarchs', <i>Hermes</i> 100 (1972) 312–42
Habicht, <i>Untersuchungen</i>	Chr. Habicht, <i>Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.</i> München 1979
Habicht, <i>Studien</i>	Chr. Habicht, <i>Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit</i> . Göttingen 1982
Habicht, 1989	Chr. Habicht, 'Athen und die Seleukiden', <i>Chiron</i> 19 (1989) 7–26
Habicht, 1990	Chr. Habicht, 'Athens and the Attalids in the Second Century B.C.', <i>Hesperia</i> 59 (1990) 561–77
Habicht, <i>GA</i>	Chr. Habicht, <i>Athen in Hellenistischer Zeit. Gesammelte Aufsätze</i> . München 1994
Habicht, <i>Athen</i>	Chr. Habicht, <i>Athen. Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit</i> . München 1995
Hug	A. Hug, 'Zu den Testamenten der griechischen Philosophen', <i>Festschrift zur Begrüßung der XXXIX. Versammlung Deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner zu Zürich</i> 1887, 1–22
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i>
<i>IK</i>	<i>Inscripfen griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien</i>
Laum <i>SGRA</i>	B. Laum, <i>Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike, II Urkunden</i> . Leipzig & Berlin 1914
<i>LG</i>	<i>Lexicographi Graeci</i>
<i>PA</i>	<i>Prosopographia Attica</i> , ed. J. Kirchner. 2 vols. Berlin 1901–3
<i>PCG</i>	<i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> edd. R. Kassel et C. Austin. Berlin & New York 1983–
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca</i> ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris 1857–66
<i>Plan.</i>	= <i>AP</i>
<i>RE</i>	<i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
<i>REA</i>	<i>Revue des Études Anciennes</i>
<i>RhM</i>	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i>
<i>RUSCH</i>	<i>Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities</i>

<i>SB Wien</i>	<i>Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien</i>
Schulin 1882	F. Schulin, <i>Das griechische Testament verglichen mit dem römischen</i> . Programm zur Rectoratsfeier der Universität Basel. Basel 1882
<i>SEG</i>	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i>
<i>SIG</i>	<i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> ed. W. Dittenberger. 3 vols. Leipzig 1915. 1917. 1920 [Syll. ³]
Sollenberger 1992	M.G. Sollenberger, 'The Lives of the Peripatetics: An Analysis of the Contents and Structure of Diogenes Laertius' "Vitae philosophorum" Book 5', <i>ANRW II</i> 36.6 (1992) 3793–3879
<i>SSR</i>	<i>Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae</i> ed. G. Giannantoni. Vols. 1, 2. Naples 1990
Susemihl <i>GGL</i>	F. Susemihl, <i>Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit</i> . 2 vols. Leipzig 1891–2
<i>SVF</i>	<i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i> ed. H. von Arnim. 3 vols. Leipzig 1905. 1903. 1903
<i>ThGL</i>	<i>Thesaurus Graecae Linguae, ab Henrico Stephano constructus</i> edd. C.B. Hase, W. & L. Dindorf, Vol. 3. Paris 1835
<i>TrGF</i>	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> Vol. 1 edd. B. Snell, R. Kannicht. Göttingen ² 1986
W = Wehrli	F. Wehrli, <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar</i> . Band 6 <i>Lykon</i> . Basel & Stuttgart ² 1968
Wilhelm	A. Wilhelm, 'Zum griechischen Wortschatz', <i>Glotta</i> 14 (1925) 68–84
<i>WS</i>	<i>Wiener Studien</i>
Zeller	E. Zeller, <i>Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung</i> . II 2 <i>Aristoteles und die alten Peripatetiker</i> . Leipzig ³ 1879
Ziebarth 1903	E. Ziebarth, 'Beiträge zum griechischen Recht', <i>Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft</i> 16 (1903) 249–315
<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

(b) Editions Used

Aeschin. <i>Socr.</i>	<i>Aischines von Sphettos. Studien zur Literaturgeschichte der Sokratiker. Untersuchungen und Fragmente</i> ed. H. Dittmar. Berlin 1912 Aeschines Socraticus: <i>SSR</i> 2.593–629
Aesopica	<i>Aesopica</i> ed. B.E. Perry. Vol. 1: <i>Greek and Latin Texts</i> . Urbana 1952
Ambr.	<i>Lexicon Ambrosianum ineditum</i> ; v. <i>Suidae Lexicon</i> 1 p. xvii–xviii Adler
Antigon.	Antigonus Carystius

10 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

- Dorandi, *Antigone* *Antigone de Caryste. Fragments* ed. T. Dorandi. Paris 1999 [CB]
- Wilamowitz, *Antigonos* U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos von Karystos*. Berlin 1881
- Antip. *Stoic.* Antipater Tarsensis: *SVF* 3.244–58
- Anton. *Antonii Monachi cognomento Melissae Loci Communes* ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris 1865 [PG 136]
- AP *Anthologia Palatina = Anthologia Graeca Epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea* ed. H. Stadtmüller. Vol. 2.1. Leipzig 1899
- Jacobs *Anthologia graeca* ed. F. Jacobs. 3 vols. Leipzig 1813–17
- APM Schenkl 'Das Florilegium "Ἀριστον καὶ πρῶτον μάθημα"', *WS* 11 (1889) 1–42
- Apollod. Apollodorus Atheniensis 244 *FGrH* 2 B 1022–1128
- Apophth. Par. *Apophthegmata Parisina*; see Corp. Par. (d)
- Apophth. Vind. C. Wachsmuth, 'Die Wiener Apophthegmen-Sammlung', *Festschrift zur Begrüßung der XXXVI. Philologen-Versammlung*. Freiburg i.B. & Tübingen 1882, 1–36
- Apul. *Apol.* *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Opera Quae Supersunt*. Vol. 2.1 *Pro se de Magia Liber (Apologia)* ed. R. Helm. Leipzig 1959 [BT]
- Arched. *Stoic.* Archedemus Tarsensis: *SVF* 3.262–4
- Aristo *Die Schule des Aristoteles* ed. F. Wehrli. Vol. 6 *Aristo von Keos*. Basel & Stuttgart ²1968
- Aristo *Stoic.* Aristo Chius: *SVF* 1.75–90
- Arist. *Fragmenta* *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta* ed. V. Rose. Leipzig 1886 [BT]
- Düring I. Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*. Göteborg 1957
- Gigon *Aristotelis Opera*. Vol. 3: *Librorum deperditorum Fragmenta* ed. O. Gigon. Berlin & New York 1987
- Apophth. D.M. Searby, *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition*. Uppsala 1998
- Ars. APΞENIOY IQNIA. *Arsenii Violetum* ed. Chr. Walz. Stuttgart 1832
- Ath. *Athenaei Naucraticae Dipnosophistarum Libri XV* ed. G. Kaibel. 3 vols. Leipzig 1887–90 [BT]
- Epit. *Athenaei Dipnosophistarum Epitome* ed. S.P. Peppink. Vol. 2.2 (*Libri IX–XV*). Leiden 1939
- Carmen de Figuris* *Carmen de figuris vel schematibus* ed. R.M. D'Angelo. Hildesheim 2001
- Chrysipp. *Stoic.* Chrysippus Soleus: *SVF* 2.1–348 & 3.3–204
- Choerob. in *Theod.* Georgius Choeroboscus, *Prolegomena et scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini canones isagogicos de flexione nominum* ed. A. Hilgard, in: *GG* 4.1. Leipzig 1894, 101–417

- Gaisford *Georgii Choerobosci dictata in Theodosii Canones necnon Epimerismi in Psalmos* ed. Th. Gaisford. Oxford 1842
- Cic. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia*
Fin. — Vol. 13, fasc. 43 *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum Libri Quinque* ed. Th. Schiche. Leipzig 1915 [BT]
Tusc. — Vol. 13, fasc. 44 *Tusculanae Disputationes* ed. M. Pohlenz. Leipzig 1918 [BT]
- Cleanth. *Stoic.* Cleanthes Assius: *SVF* 1.103–37
- Clem. Al. *Strom.* *Clemens Alexandrinus*. Vol. 2: *Stromata Buch I–VI* edd. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel. Berlin ³1960 [GCS]
- Corp. Par. (a) *Corpus Parisinum*, i.e., ‘Excerpta Parisina’ in cod. Par. Gr. 1168 ff. 83^v–121^v, see L. Sternbach, ‘Excerpta Parisina’, *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejetnosci Wydzial Filologiczny* 2,5 (1894) Krakowie, 53–82
- Corp. Par. (d) *Corpus Parisinum*, i.e., ‘Apophtegmata Parisina’ in cod. Par. Gr. 1168 ff. 146^v–162^v; see H. Schenkl, ‘Die epiktetischen Fragmente. Eine Untersuchung zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der griechischen Florilegien’, *SB Wien* 115 (1888) 480–90
- Crantor H.J. Mette, ‘Zwei Akademiker heute: Krantor von Soloi und Arkesilaos von Pitane’, *Lustrum* 26 (1984) 7–94
- Critolaus *Die Schule des Aristoteles* ed. F. Wehrli. Vol. 10 *Hieronimos von Rhodos. Kritolaos und seine Schüler*. Basel & Stuttgart ²1969
- Diodorus Tyrius *Die Schule des Aristoteles* ed. F. Wehrli. Vol. 10 *Hieronimos von Rhodos. Kritolaos und seine Schüler*. Basel & Stuttgart ²1969
- Diog. Bab. *Stoic.* Diogenes Babylonius: *SVF* 3.210–43
- Diog. Sinop. Diogenes Sinopeus: *SSR* 2.227–509
- D.L. *Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum*, Vol. 1 *Libri I–X*, Vol. 2 *Excerpta Byzantina et Indices* ed. M. Marcovich. Stuttgart & Leipzig 1999 [BT]
- Bentley *Richardi Bentleii Opuscula Philologica, dissertationem in Phalaridis Epistolas ... complectentia*. Leipzig 1781
- Budaeus G. de Budé, in: Diels, p. 313
- Casaubon *Isaaci Casauboni Notae Ad Diogenis Laertii libros de vitis, dictis et decretis principum philosophorum. Editio altera, auctior et emendatior*, in: *Diog. Laert. De Vitis, dogm. et apophth. clarorum philosophorum, Libri X* ed. H. Stephanus. Genève 1594 (in: Hübner, *Commentarii* 1, 90–1)
- Cobet *Diogenis Laertii De clarorum philosophorum vitis, dogmatibus et apophthegmatibus libri decem* ed. C.G. Cobet. Paris 1850
- Diels H. Diels, ‘Reiskii Animadversiones in Laertium Diogenem’, *Hermes* 24 (1889) 302–25

12 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

- Frob. *Diogenis Laertii De vitis, decretis, et responsis celebrium philosophorum Libri decem* edd. H. Frobenius et N. Episcopus. Basel 1533
- Hübner *Diogenis Laertii de Vitis, Dogmatis et Apophthegmatis Clarorum Philosophorum Libri Decem* ed. H.G. Hübner. Vol. 1 (360–6) Leipzig 1828 (*Appendix critica* Vol. 2, Leipzig 1831, 732)
- Hübner, *Comm.* *Commentarii in Diogenem Laertium* ed. H.G. Hübner. Vol. 1 (*Isaaci Casauboni ad Diogenem Laertium Notae*, 7–138; *Aegidii Menagii Observationes et Emendationes in Diogenem Laertium*, 139–670). Leipzig 1830
- van Lennep *Phalaridis Epistolae quas Latinas fecit interpositis Carolis Boyle notis; commentario illustravit Ioannes Daniel a Lennep* ed. L.C. Valckenaer. Groningen 1777
- Long *Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum* ed. H.S. Long. 2 vols. Oxford 1964 [OCT]
- Menagius *Aegidius Menagius, Observationes et emendationes in Diogenem Laertium*. Paris 1663 (in: Hübner, *Commentarii* 1, 139–670)
- Narcy 1999 M. Narcy, ‘Livre V. Introduction, traduction et notes’, in: *Diogène Laërce. Vies et Doctrines des Philosophes Illustres*. Traduction française sous la direction de M.-O. Goulet-Cazé. Paris 1999, 541–653
- Reiske J.J. Reiske, in: Diels
- Ephor. Ephoros von Kyme 70 *FGrH* 2 A 37–109
- Epich. Epicharmus *PCG* Vol. 1 (2001) 8–137
- Eudem. *Die Schule des Aristoteles* ed. F. Wehrli. Vol. 8 *Eudemos von Rhodos*. Basel & Stuttgart ²1969
- Eust. *Od.* *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam* ed. G. Stallbaum. Leipzig 1825
- Exc. Flor. *Excerpta Florentina* (e cod. Laur. gr. 8.22) = *Appendix ex cod. ms. Florentino Parallelorum Sacrorum Joannis Damasceni*, in: *Ioannis Stobaei Florilegium* ed. A. Meineke, Vol. 4. Leipzig 1857, 145–246
- Exc. Par. *Excerpta Parisina*; see Corp. Par. (a)
- Flor. Leid. *Florilegium Leidense* ed. L.R. Beynen. Diss. Leiden 1837
- Flor. Mon. *Florilegium Monacense*: in: *Ioannis Stobaei Florilegium* ed. A. Meineke, Vol. 4. Leipzig 1857, 267–90
- Glyco J.C. Orelli, *Opuscula Graecorum veterum sententiosa et moralia* 2. Leipzig 1821, p. 200–2
- Gnom. Basil. *Gnomica Basileensia* ed. J.F. Kindstrand. Uppsala 1991
- Gnom. Hom. A. Elter, Γνωμικὰ ὁμοιώματα *des Socrates, Plutarch, Demophilus, Demonax, Aristonymus u.a.* Programm Bonn 1–5. 1900–4
- Gnom. Pal. *Gnomologium Palatinum* (Palatinus Graecus 356) ed. C. Wachsmuth, ‘De Gnomologio Palatino Inedito’ (*Commen-*

- tatio ex satyra philologa Hermanno Sauppio oblata seorsum expressa*). Berlin 1879
- Gnom. Vat. *Gnomologium Vaticanum e codice Vaticano Graeco 743* ed. L. Sternbach. Berlin 1963 (= WS 9 (1887) 175–206; 10 (1888) 1–49, 211–60; 11 (1889) 43–64, 192–242)
- Gorg. Gorgias: 82 *DK* 2.271–307
Gorgias von Leontinoi. Reden, Fragmente und Testimonien ed. Th. Buchheim. Hamburg 1989
- Heracl. Pont. *Die Schule des Aristoteles* ed. F. Wehrli. Vol. 7 *Herakleides Pontikos*. Basel & Stuttgart ²1969
- Herillus Herillus Carthaginiensis Stoicus: *SVF* 1.91–2
- Hermipp. *Die Schule des Aristoteles* ed. F. Wehrli. Suppl. 1 *Hermippos der Kallimacheer*. Basel & Stuttgart 1974
Hermippos of Smyrna ed. J. Bollansée. Leiden 1999 (*FGrH* IV A 3)
- Hdn. Gr. *Herodiani Technici Reliquiae* ed. A. Lentz. Vol. 2.1 *Reliqua Scripta Prosodiaca, Pathologiam, Orthographica Continentens*. Leipzig 1868 [*BT*]
- Hieronym. *Hieronymus of Rhodes: The Sources, Text and Translation* ed. S.A. White, *RUSCH* 12 (2004), 79–276
Die Schule des Aristoteles ed. F. Wehrli. Vol. 10 *Hieronymos von Rhodos. Kritolaos und seine Schüler*. Basel & Stuttgart ²1969
- Joh. Damasc. see Exc. Flor.
- Laur. *Florilegium Laurentianum* (cod. Laur. gr. 8.22 ff. 74^r–189^v), partly edited in *Exc. Flor.* (ff. 74^r–125^v ~ 147–182 Meineke; ff. 134^v–189^v ~ 183–246 Meineke)
- Leucippus Leukippos 67 *DK* 2.70–81
- Lyco Pythagoreus Lykon 57 *DK* 1.445–6; 1110 *FGrH* IV A 7,432–9
- Melissa Augustana see Patm.
- Ps.-Max. S. Ihm, *Ps.-Maximus Confessor. Erste kritische Edition einer Redaktion des sacro-profanen Florilegiums Loci communes*. Stuttgart 2001
- MaxI a shorter version of the *Loci communes* (Ihm, p. LIII–LXII)
- MaxII a longer version of the *Loci communes* (Ihm, p. XXXVIII–LIII)
- MaxU the longer version of the *Loci communes* with a different order of chapters (Ihm, p. XXX–XXXVIII)
- Combefis Maximi Abbatis, *Capita Theologica scite Dicta atque Electa* ed. R.P.F. Combefis. Paris 1865 [*PG* 91, 721–1018] (cp. Ihm, p. CII)
- Ribittus *Loci Communes Sententiarum, quas s. pater Maximus ex sacris & profanis libris Graecis congegit, Ioanne Ribitto interprete*, in: *Sententiarum sive capitum ... tomi tres*. Tiguri 1546, 179–263 (cp. Ihm, p. C–CI)

14 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

- Semenov V. Semenov, *Melissa: ein byzantinisches Florilegium*. Munich 1968 (reprint of St. Petersburg 1893) (cp. Ihm, p. CIII)
- Muson. C. Musonii Rufi Reliquiae ed. O. Hense. Leipzig 1905 [BT]
Panaetius Panaetii Rhodii Fragmenta ed. M. van Straaten. Leiden ³1962 (1952)
Panezio di Rodi. Testimonianze ed. F. Alesse. Naples 1997
- Panthoides Megaricus Panthoides Megaricus: SSR 1.471
Patm. Un traité de vie spirituelle et morale du XI^e siècle: le florilège sacro-profane du manuscrit 6 de Patmos ed. É. Sargologos. Thessaloniki 1990 = Melissa Augustana
- Phld. Acad. Hist. Philodemus, Academicorum Historia, in: Filodemo. Storia dei Filosofi. Platone e l'Accademia ed. T. Dorandi. Naples 1991
- Phot. Bibl. Photius. Bibliothèque ed. R. Henry. Vol. 2. Paris 1960. [CB]
Plu. De Exil. De Exilio: Plutarchi Moralia Vol. 3 edd. W.R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, W. Sieveking. Leipzig 1929 [BT]
- De aud. Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat: Plutarchi Moralia Vol. 1 edd. W.R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, M. Pohlenz, H. Gärtner. Leipzig ²1974 [BT]
- Pos. Posidonius. I. The Fragments edd. L. Edelstein, I.G. Kidd. Cambridge ²1989 (1972)
- Praxiphanes Die Schule des Aristoteles ed. F. Wehrli. Vol. 9 Phainias von Eresos. Chamaileon. Praxiphanes. Basel & Stuttgart ²1969
- Ross. Florilegium Rossianum ineditum (cod. Vat. Ross. 736 = Gr. 10 & cod. Vat. Barb. gr. 522) (cp. Ihm, Ps.-Maximus Confessor, p. XVI)
- Rutilius Lupus P. Rutilii Lupi De Figuris Sententiarum et Elocutionis ed. E. Brooks, Jr. Leiden 1970
- Gesner Primae lineae artis oratoriae exercitationum ad eas instituendarum causa olim ductae et nunc passim auctae et emendatae. Accedunt Rutilii Lupi, Aquilae Romani, Iulii Rufiniani rhetorum antiquorum reliqua ed. J.M. Gesner. Jena 1753
- Halm Rhetores Latini Minores ed. C. Halm. Leipzig 1863, 3–21
Jacob P. Rutilii Lupi De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis libri duo ed. F. Jacob. Lübeck 1837
- Ruhnken P. Rutilii Lupi de Figuris Sententiarum et Elocutionis, Libri duo ed. D. Ruhnken. Leiden 1768 [re-edited by C.H. Frotscher. Leipzig 1831]
- Stephanus, R. De Figuris Sententiarum ac Verborum. P. Rutilii Lupi ll. II. Aquilae Romani liber I. Jul. Rufiniani ll. II ed. R. Stephanus. Paris 1530
- Socrates in SSR 1
Speus. Speusippo. Frammenti ed. M. Isnardi Parente. Napoli 1980
L. Tarán, Speusippos of Athens. A critical study with a collection of the related texts and commentary. Leiden 1981

St. Byz.	<i>Stephani Byzantii Ethnorum Quae supersunt</i> ed. A. Meineke. Vol. 1. Berlin 1849
Stob. <i>Anth.</i>	<i>Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium</i> edd. C. Wachsmuth et O. Hense. Vols. 2, 3 ed. O. Hense. Berlin 1884. 1894
Strato	<i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> ed. F. Wehrli. Vol. 5 <i>Straton von Lampsakos</i> . Basel & Stuttgart ² 1969
Suda	<i>Suidae Lexicon</i> ed. A. Adler. 4 vols. Leipzig 1928–35 [LG 1]
Themistius	<i>Themistii Orationes Quae Supersunt</i> edd. G. Downey, A.F. Norman. Vol. 2. Leipzig 1971 [BT]
Thphr.	see <i>FHS&G</i> under (a)
Vita Aristotelis	ΒΙΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ. <i>Vitarum Scriptores Graeci Minores</i> ed. A. Westermann. Braunschweig 1845
Düring	<i>Vita Hesychii</i> , in: Düring, 80–93 (see <i>Arist. Fragmenta</i>)
Gigon	<i>Vita Hesychii</i> , in: Gigon, 26–8 (see <i>Arist. Fragmenta</i>)
Zeno <i>Stoic.</i>	Zeno Citieus: <i>SVF</i> 1.3–71

(c) Other abbreviations

a.	anno/annis	litt.	littera, -ae, etc.
a. (in titulis)	altitudo	marg.	(in) margine
aCn	ante Christum natum	no.	numerus
add.	addidit	om.	omisit/omiserunt
adn.	adnotatio	pCn	post Christum natum
ap.	apud	rell.	reliqui
app.	apparatus criticus	s.	saeculo
cett.	ceteri	secl.	seclutit
cf.	confer	ss.	suprascriptum, -o
codd.	codices	suppl.	supplevit
coll.	collato/collatis	s.v.	sub voce
corr.	correxit	T	testimonium
cr. (in titulis)	crassitudo	tit.	titulus
ed. pr.	edidit primus	v.	vide
edd.	editores/ediderunt	v (in titulis)	vacat
F	fragmentum	vulg.	vulgata
l. (in titulis)	longitudo	*	not in Wehrli

(d) Symbols used in the apparatus

<α>	littera suppleta/addenda
[α]	littera spuria, eliminanda
†...†	locus nondum sanatus
α	littera in titulo incerta
[α]	littera in titulo non servata et coniectura suppleta
[α]	littera in titulo erasa
vy	duae litterae in titulo unum spatium occupant

I. VITA

- 1 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.65–74 (BT 1.354.18–360.15 Marcovich)

[ΛΥΚΩΝ]

2/22 W 65 τοῦτον διεδέξατο Λύκων Ἀστυάνακτος Τρωαδεύς,
 18 W φραστικὸς ἀνὴρ καὶ περὶ παίδων ἀγωγῆς ἄκρως συν-
 τεταγμένος. ἔφασκε γὰρ δεῖν παρεξυῆσθαι τοῖς παισὶ
 τὴν αἰδῶ καὶ φιλοτιμίαν ὥς τοῖς ἵπποις μύωπα καὶ χα- 5
 18 W λινόν. τὸ δὲ ἐκφραστικὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ περιγεγονὸς ἐν
 27 W τῇ ἑρμηνείᾳ φαίνεται κἀνθάδε· φησὶ γὰρ τοῦτον τὸν
 τρόπον ἐπὶ παρθένου πενιχρᾶς· “βαρὺ γὰρ φορτίον πα-
 τρὶ κόρη διὰ σπάνιν προικὸς ἐκτρέχουσα τὸν ἀκμαῖον
 18 W τῆς ἡλικίας καιρόν.” διὸ δὴ καὶ φασιν Ἀντίγονον ἐπ’ 10
 αὐτοῦ τοῦτο εἰπεῖν, ὥς οὐκ ἦν ὥσπερ μήλου τὴν εὖω-
 διάν καὶ χάριν ἄλλοθί που μετενεγκεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐπ’ αὐ-
 τοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθάπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ δένδρου τῶν λεγο-
 66 μένων ἕκαστον ἔδει θεωρεῖσθαι. τοῦτο δὲ ὅτι ἐν μὲν τῷ
 λέγειν γλυκύτατος ἦν· παρὸ καὶ τινες τὸ γάμμα αὐτοῦ 15
 τῷ ὀνόματι προσετίθεσαν· ἐν δὲ τῷ γράφειν ἀνόμοιος

2–131 *IK* 53 (1997) *T* 169.9 p. 252–5 2–27 Wilamowitz, *Antigonos*,
 83–4 2 τοῦτον διεδέξατο Λύκων] cf. 2.7; **3A–B**; 4.12–17; 8.5–6;
11.6 || Ἀστυάνακτος] cf. 6.5 || Τρωαδεύς] cf. 2.7; app. 6.5; **13.3** et **Φ**
 (BT 2.257.27 Marcovich) 3 περὶ παίδων ἀγωγῆς] cf. **16** et 5.50
Theophrasti Περὶ παίδων ἀγωγῆς α’ 4–10 ἔφασκε—καιρόν **Φ** (BT
 2.257.27–258.5 Marcovich) 4–6 ἔφασκε—χαλινόν] cf. 4.6; 5.39
 (= *Gnom. Vat.* 52); *Ephor.* 70 *T* 28ab *FGrH*; et v. *Thphr. no. 1 FHS&G*
app. ad 34–8 14–17 ἐν μὲν τῷ λέγειν—αὐτῷ] cf. **11.6–7** 15–
 16 παρὸ—προσετίθεσαν] cf. app. 2.7; app. **16**; **19**; **20**; **21**

conspectus siglorum:

<i>B</i>	<i>Neapolitanus Burbonicus III B 29</i> (s. XII)
<i>B</i> ²	codicis <i>B</i> ¹ corrector
<i>P</i>	<i>Parisinus gr. 1759</i> (s. XIII exeunte)
<i>P</i> ² , <i>P</i> ⁴	codicis <i>P</i> correctores
<i>F</i>	<i>Laurentianus 69.13</i> (s. XIII)
<i>Ω</i>	consensus codd. <i>BPF</i> = hyparchetypon
codicis <i>P</i> apographon:	

→

I. LIFE

- 1 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 5.65–74 (BT 1.354. 18–360.15 Marcovich)¹

[Lyco]

- 65 This man (Strato) was succeeded by Lyco, the son of Astyanax, of Troas, an eloquent man and keenly focused on the upbringing of children. For he used to say that restraint and ambition must be joined by yoke to children as spur and bridle (are) to horses. His eloquence and his superiority² in expression are clear in the following as well: he speaks in the following manner about a penniless maiden: “For a heavy burden to a father is a girl who for lack of a dowry outruns the peak time of her (marriageable) age.” Indeed, this is the reason they say that Antigonus³ said the following about him: that it was not possible to transfer as it were the sweet smell and charm of an apple to any other place, but that each of his (Lyco’s) utterances had to be observed ‘on’ the man himself just as (the qualities of the apple must be observed) on the tree.
- 66 This (was said) because in speaking he was surpassingly sweet—hence some people even added the (letter) gamma to his name⁴—but in writing he was not equal to himself. At any rate, also in the

¹ On Book 5 of the *Lives of the Philosophers* see Sollenberger 1992. On the *Life of Lyco* see J. Mejer in this volume.

² Casaubon’s generally accepted conjecture περιγεγωνός (a verb not attested elsewhere) is taken to mean ‘sonorousness’.

³ Antigonus II Gonatas (277–39); cp. Dorandi, *Antigone*, p. lxvi.

⁴ Glyco (instead of Lyco) would be derived from *glukus* ‘sweet’. On the nickname Glyco see H.B. Gottschalk, *Phronesis* 18 (1973) 95–6.

Q Parisinus gr. 1758 (s. XIV ineunte)
 excerptum Byzantinum (BT 2.257.26–258.6 Marcovich):
 Φ Vaticanus gr. 96 (s. XII medii)
 X consensus Ω et Φ = archetypon

1 tit. P⁴: om. Ω (sed 2 ΛΥΚΩΝ litt. uncialibus B²) 2 cum διεδέξατο explicit caput in BP 3 (ἐκ)φραστικός Reiske 312 || ἀγωγὴν Cobet (cf. 129) 6 φραστικὸν F || περιγεγωνός X: περιγεγωνός Casaubon 78 7 κἀνθάδε Ω: -ταῦθα Φ 8 γάρ om. Φ 11 ὥσπερ secl. Marcovich 12 ἀλλ’] καὶ Marcovich

- 23 W αὐτῷ. ἀμέλει γοῦν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μεταγινωσκόντων ἐπει-
 δὴ μὴ ἔμαθον ὅτε καιρὸς καὶ εὐχομένων τοῦτον ἐκαλ-
 λιλέκτει τὸν τρόπον· ἔλεγεν αὐτῶν κατηγορεῖν ἀδυνά-
 τῳ μηνύοντας εὐχῇ μετάνοιαν ἀργίας ἀδιόρθωτον. 20
- 24 W τοὺς τε βουλευομένους (οὐκ) ὀρθῶς διαπίπτειν ἔφασκε
 τῷ λογισμῷ, οἷονεὶ στρεβλῷ κανόνι βασανίζοντας
 εὐθεΐαν φύσιν ἢ πρόσωπον ὕδατι κλυδαττομένῳ ἢ
 25 W κατόπτρῳ διεστραμμένῳ. καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀγο-
 ρᾶς στέφανον πολλοὺς ἀπιέναι, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν Ὀλυμπία- 25
 12 W 67 σιν ἢ ὀλίγους ἢ οὐδένα. πολλάκις τε πολλὰ συμβου-
 λεύσας Ἀθηναίοις, τὰ μέγιστα αὐτοὺς ὠφέλησεν.
- 8 W ἦν δὲ καὶ καθαρώτατος τὴν στολήν, ὥς ἀνυπερ-
 βλήτῳ χρῆσθαι μαλακότητι ἱματίων, καθά φησιν Ἑρ-
 μιππος. ἀλλὰ καὶ γυμναστικώτατος ἐγένετο καὶ εὐέκ- 30
 της τὸ σῶμα τὴν τε πᾶσαν σχέσιν ἀθλητικὴν ἐπιφαί-
 νων, ὠτοθλαδίας καὶ ἐμπινῆς ὦν, καθά φησιν Ἀντί-
 γονος ὁ Καρύστιος· διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ παλαιῶσαι λέγεται
- 11 W τά τε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι Ἰλίου καὶ σφαιρίσαι. ὥς οὐκ ἄλ-
 λος τε ἦν φίλος τοῖς περὶ Εὐμενῇ καὶ Ἀτταλον, οἱ 35
 καὶ πλεῖστα ἐπεχορήγουν αὐτῷ. ἐπειράθη δ' αὐτὸν
 10 W 68 σχεῖν καὶ Ἀντίοχος, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔτυχεν. οὕτω δὲ ἦν ἐχ-
 θρὸς Ἱερωνύμῳ τῷ Περιπατητικῷ, ὥς μόνον μὴ ἀπαν-
 τᾶν πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἐτήσιον ἡμέραν, περὶ ἧς ἐν τῷ
 περὶ Ἀρκεσιλάου βίῳ διειλέγεμθα. 40
- 5 W ἀφηγήσατο δὲ τῆς σχολῆς ἔτη τέτταρα πρὸς τοῖς

26–7 πολλάκις—ὠφέλησεν] *cf.* 5; 6; 7.6–8 28–33 ἦν—
 Καρύστιος] *cf.* 8 28–30 *Hermipp. F 57 Wehrli = 1026 F 74 FGrH*
 30–40 *Wilamowitz, Antigonos, 85* 30–4 *Antigon. F 24 Dorandi*
 30–2 ἀλλὰ καὶ—ὦν Φ (*BT 2.258.5–6 Marcovich*) 32–3 ὠτο-
 θλαδίας—Καρύστιος] *Suda ω 265 s.v. ὠτοκάταξις (LG 1.3.629.21*
Adler) 34–40 *Hieronym. F 6 White* 34 σφαιρίσαι] *cf.* 8.41– 2
 37–40 *Hieronym. F 3 Wehrli* 39–40 ἐν τῷ—διειλέγεμθα] *v.* 4.41
 (= *Hieronym. F 4 White, F 4 Wehrli*) 41–4 *Strato F 9 Wehrli* 41–
 4 & 45–6 *Apollod. 244 F 350 FGrH* 41 ἀφηγήσατο δὲ τῆς σχολῆς]
v. ad 2

17 αὐτῷ *B*²: αὐτῷ Ω || γοῦν *om. F* 18 μὴ *om. F* 19 ἔλεγε (γάρ·)
Marcovich || αὐτῶν *Hübner*: αὐτῶν *PB*²: αὐτῷ *B*: αὐτὸν *F* 20
 ἀδιόρθωτου *Cobet* 21 οὐκ *add. Casaubon* 78 23 κλυδατ-
 τομένῳ *F*: -ομένων *B*: -όμενον *P* 33 δὲ *om F* 34 τε *del. Reiske* →

case of those who are feeling regret in view of the fact that they have not acquired learning when the time was right and are praying (that they might still do so), he turned a beautiful phrase in the following manner: he said that they denounce themselves by betraying in impotent prayer an irremediable regret about their laziness. And of those who deliberate <in>correctly he used to say that they fall to pieces through their reasoning, as if they were examining a straight substance with a crooked (carpenter's) ruler, or a face in rough water or in a distorted mirror. And also that, whereas many go in pursuit of the wreath to be won at the town center (*agora*), either few or none (go) in pursuit of the (wreath to be
67 won) at Olympia. And, in fact, on many occasions he gave the Athenians advice on many matters and thus conferred the greatest benefits on them.

He was, on the one hand, exceedingly neat in his dress, so as to use an unsurpassed softness of clothing, according to Hermippus. But at the same time he proved to be exceedingly well-trained and in good physical condition, displaying all the marks of an athlete, having cauliflower ears and a bronzed complexion, according to Antigonus of Carystus. Hence he is said even to have wrestled at the Games of Ilium⁵ in his home country and to have played ball. He was, more than anyone else, on good terms with Eumenes and Attalus and the people around them, who even supported him with large donations.⁶ Antiochus too tried to get him, but did not suc-
68 ceed.⁷ He was such an enemy of Hieronymus the Peripatetic that he (Lyco) alone refused to join him (Hieronymus) at his house for the anniversary day, about which we have spoken in the Life of Arcesilaus.⁸

He was leader of the school for forty-four years, Strato having

⁵ On the Games of Ilium (the *Ilieia*) see Dorandi, *Antigone*, n. 123 p. 51.

⁶ Eumenes I of Pergamum (263–41) and his successor Attalus I of Pergamum (241–197). Cp. Wehrli p. 23 on F 11; Habicht 1990, 562 (= *GA* 184).

⁷ Probably Antiochus II Theos (*RE* 22) rather than Antiochus I Soter (*RE* 21). Cp. Wehrli p. 23 on F 11; Habicht 1989, 9 (= *GA* 166).

⁸ Cp. Wehrli p. 23 on F 10. The anniversary was held in honor of Halcyoneus, son of Antigonus Gonatas. See E. Matelli in this volume.

- 3 W τετταράκοντα, Στράτωνος αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις
 16 W καταλιπόντος κατὰ τὴν ἐβδόμην καὶ εἰκοστὴν καὶ
 ἐκατοστὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ Πανθοίδου 45
 διήκουσε τοῦ διαλεκτικοῦ. ἐτελεύτησε δὲ γεγωνὸς
 ἔτος τέταρτον καὶ ἐβδομηκοστόν, νόσῳ ποδαγρικῇ
 καταπονηθεῖς. καὶ ἔστιν ἡμῶν εἰς αὐτόν·
 οὐ μὰ τόν, οὐδὲ Λύκωνα παρήσομεν, ὅτι ποδαλγὴς
 κάτθανε· θαυμάζω τοῦτο μάλιστα δ' ἐγώ,
 τὴν οὕτως αἰδοῦ μακρὴν ὁδὸν ὥς πρὶν ὁ ποσσὶν 50
 ἄλλοτρίοις βαδίσας ἔδραμε νυκτὶ μιῇ.
 69 γεγόνασι δὲ Λύκωνες καὶ ἄλλοι· πρῶτος Πυθαγο-
 ρικός, δεῦτερος αὐτὸς οὗτος, τρίτος ἐπὼν ποιητῆς, τέ-
 тарτος ἐπιγραμμάτων ποιητῆς.
 15 W τοῦ δὲ φιλοσόφου καὶ διαθήκαις περιετύχονεν 55
 ταῖσδε·
 “τάδε διατίθεμαι περὶ τῶν κατ' ἐμαυτόν, ἐὰν μὴ
 δυνηθῶ τὴν ἀρρωστίαν ταύτην ὑπενεγκεῖν. τὰ μὲν ἐν
 οἴκῳ πάντα δίδωμι τοῖς ἀδελφ(ιδ)οῖς Ἀστυάνακτι καὶ
 Λύκωνι. καὶ οἶμαι δεῖν ἀποδοθῆναι ἀπὸ τούτων ὅσα 60
 κατακέχρημαι Ἀθήνησι παρὰ τινος ἔχων †ἢ πεπραχ-
 ῶς†· καὶ ἃ ἂν εἰς τὴν ἐκφορὰν ἀναλωθῇ καὶ εἰς τᾶλλα
 70 (τὰ) νομιζόμενα. τὰ δὲ ἐν ἅστει καὶ ἐν Αἰγίνῃ δίδωμι
 Λύκωνι διὰ τὸ καὶ τοῦνομα φέρειν ἡμῶν καὶ συνδια-

42–3 Στράτωνος — καταλιπόντος] v. 4.12 43–4 κατὰ τὴν — Ὀλυμ-
 πιάδα] i.e., 272/1–269/8 44–5 *Panthoides Megaricus II Q 1 SSR*
1.471 Giannantoni 48–51 *AP 7.112 sub titulo Εἰς Λύκωνα, τὸν*
φιλόσοφον = Plan. 3.92 in capite 6 ‘εἰς ἄνδρα οὐκ ἐπισήμους’
52–3 Lyco Iasensis 1110 T 3 FGrH IV A 7 p. 432 = Lyco Pythagoreus
57 A 1 DK; RE 13 (1927) 2308–09 s.v. Lykon 15 55–127 cf. 3.41–3
(Plato); 5.11–16 (Aristoteles); 5.51–7 (Theophrastus); 5.61–4 = 4
(Strato); 10.16–21 (Epicurus)

42 αὐτὴν Long, sed cf. Pl. Lg. 740 B et H. Bolkestein, *Mnemosyne* 19
 (1966) 191³ 47 καταπονηθεῖς om. F || καὶ ἡμῶν BP 48 ὅτι Ω:
 corr. P² 49 δ' ἐγώ] λέγω BP: ἐγώ F: corr. P² 50 ὥς Scaliger ap.
 Jacobs III 243 (*approbantibus Jacobs III p. LII et Hermann ap. Hübner*
2.732): ἃ- BP: ἃ F: ἃ Pal.: ἂν P² (ἦν Q), ἂν P⁴: εἰ Jacobs III 243
 || ποσσὶν BF AP: πουσὶν P 59 διαδίδωμι F || ἀδελφ(ιδ)οῖς Pom-
 tow, GGA 175.3, 1913, 169 adn. 1: ἀδελφοῖς Ω 61 ἢ πεπραχὼς Ω:
 ἢ ἐκπεπραχὼς Frob.: (μ)ῇ ἐκπεπραχὼς Diels 313 62 ἀναλωθῇ
 PF: -δοθῇ B 63 τὰ add. P⁴ (cf. 88)

appointed him (as scholarch) in his will during the one hundred and twenty-seventh Olympiad. Not but what he also attended the lectures of Panthoides the dialectician.⁹ He died at the age of seventy-four, brought low by the gout. And ours is (the following epigram) on him:

Not by Gad, neither Lyco will we pass over,
because he died of the gout. But this I wonder about most,
how a man who before had walked with feet not his own
thus ran the long road to Hades in a single night.

- 69 There have also been other Lyco's. First, a Pythagorean; second, our man himself; third, a poet of epic verses; fourth, a poet of epigrams.

We have also come across the philosopher's will, which reads as follows:¹⁰

- "These are my dispositions concerning my personal affairs, in case I shall not be able to endure this illness. All my property at home¹¹ I give to my nephews Astyanax and Lyco.¹² And I think it right that out of these are paid back all things I have on loan at Athens from someone, having (them) in possession †or having negotiated them†;¹³ and also whatever expenditures there will be
70 for my funeral and for the other customary rites. My property in town and in Aegina I give to Lyco because of the fact that he bears my name and at the same time has lived with me during the long-

⁹ On the peculiar placing of this piece of information see Sollenberger 1992, 3807–8.

¹⁰ On Lyco's testament see Sollenberger 1992, 3870–2; Gottschalk 1972, 321; Bruns 1880, 41–6 [= KS 227–32]; Dareste 1882, 14–18; Schulin 1882; Hug 1887, 9–11; 14; 16; 20–2; Ziebarth 1903, 269–70.

¹¹ I.e., in the Troad; cp. Wehrli p. 24 on F 15–16; Gottschalk 1972, 318.

¹² 'My nephews' is a conjecture by Pomtow; the MSS. read 'the brothers'. The Lyco of l. 60 (1) appears to be the same as the Lyco mentioned in ll. 64–6, who (2) again appears to be the same as the nephew Lyco mentioned in l. 70 (the Lyco in l. 69 being an entirely different person). If (2) is correct, Astyanax and Lyco mentioned in ll. 59–60 were nephews of Lyco. Cp. Sollenberger 1992, 3870 n. 393 (with references).

¹³ The text is almost certainly corrupt. The translation is an attempt to render the reading of the MSS. Frobenius' reading would mean: 'or having exacted the payment of it', which does not seem to make sense; Diels' conjecture would mean: 'if (someone) has not exacted the payment (of it)'. For a different interpretation of this difficult passage see M. Narcy 1999, 630 and 650–3.

τετριφέναι πλείω χρόνον ἄρεστῶς πάνυ, καθάπερ 65
δίκαιον ἦν τὸν υἱοῦ τάξιν ἐσχηκότα.

“τὸν δὲ Περίπατον καταλείπω τῶν γνωρίμων τοῖς
βουλομένοις, Βούλωνι, Καλλίνῳ, Ἀρίστωνι, Ἀμφίωνι,
Λύκωνι, Πύθωνι, Ἀριστομάχῳ, Ἡρακλείῳ, Λυκο- 70
μήδει, Λύκωνι τῷ ἀδελφιδῷ. προστησάσθωσαν δὲ αὐ-
τοῖ ὄν ἄν ὑπολαμβάνωσι διαμενεῖν ἐπὶ τοῦ πράγματος
καὶ συνέξιν μάλιστα δυνήσεσθαι. συγκατασκευαζέ-
τωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ γνώριμοι κάμου καὶ τοῦ τόπου
χάριν.

“περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐκφορᾶς καὶ καύσεως ἐπιμεληθήτω- 75
σαν Βούλων καὶ Καλλίνος μετὰ τῶν συνήθων, ὅπως
71 μὴτ’ ἀνελεύθερος γένηται μῆτε περίεργος. τῶν δὲ ἐν
Αἰγίνῃ μοι γενομένων μερῶν μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀπόλυσιν
καταχωρησάτω Λύκων τοῖς νεανίσκοις εἰς ἐλαιοχρισ-
τίαν, ὅπως κάμου καὶ τοῦ τιμήσαντος ἐμὲ μνήμη γένη- 80
ται διὰ τῆς χρείας ταύτης ἢ προσήκουσα. καὶ ἀνδριά-
ντα ἡμῶν ἀναθέτω· τὸν δὲ τόπον, ὅπως ἀρμόττων ἦ τῆς
στάσεως, ἐπιβλεψάτω καὶ συμπραγματευθήτω Διό-
φαντος καὶ Ἡρακλείδης Δημητρίου. ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἐν
ἄστει Λύκων ἀποδότω πᾶσι παρῶν ἃ προείληφα με- 85
τὰ τὴν ἀποδημίαν τὴν ἐκείνου. παρεχέσθωσαν δὲ Βού-
λων καὶ Καλλίνος καὶ ἃ ἄν εἰς τὴν ἐκφορὰν ἀναλωθῇ
καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ νομιζόμενα. κομισάσθω(σαν) δὲ ταῦτα

67–72 *Aristo F 6 Wehrli; Laum SGRA 16; cf. 4.12–15* 67–8 τὸν δὲ
Περίπατον—βουλομένοις] *cf. 5.52 (Theophrastus)* 72–4 συγ-
κατασκευαζέτωσαν—χάριν] *cf. 4.13–15* 77–81 *Laum SGRA 16*

68 καὶ Καλλίνῳ *F II Ἀμφίωνι om. F* 71 διαμένειν *Ω: corr. Cobet*
72 συναύξειν *Cobet* 78 μοριῶν *Cobet: μορῶν Scaliger ap. Men-*
agium (Hübner, Comm. 1.649) 79 καταχωρησάτω *B: -ρισάτω PF;*
cf. H.C. Youtie, BASP 15 (1978) 179–83 79–80 ἐλαιοχριστίαν
Budaëus in ThGL 3.665 s.v. ἐλαιοχριστία, Reiske 313: ἐλεοχριστίαν
Ω: ἐλαιοχρηστίαν Frob.: ἐλαιοχρίστιον Wilhelm 73 80–1 γένη-
ται *B: γί- PF* 81 ταύτης *Wilhelm 73: αὐτῆς BF: αὕτη P* 82
ἀρμόττων *BF* 82–8 ἦ—τᾶλλα *om. B spatium versuum 6 relicto* 83
στάσεως *PF: καταστάσεως Hübner* 85 παρῶν ἃ *PF: παρ’ ὧν ἃ*
Frob.: παρ’ ὧν τι Cobet; cf. ἐπειδὴν δὲ παραγένηται Ἀρκεσίλαος
5.63 = 4.32 II προείληφα P: προσ- F 86 παρεχέσθωσαν *Cobet:*
παρεπ- F: παρακολουθοῦσι P 88 τὰ ἄλλα *PF II κομισάσθωσαν*
Cobet: κομισάσθω Ω II ταῦτα BP: πάντα F

est period of time to my great satisfaction, as was proper for one who has acquired the position of a son.

“The *Peripatos*¹⁴ I leave to those of the members who wish to make use of it, Bulo, Callinus, Aristo, Amphio, Lyco, Pytho, Aristomachus, Heracleus, Lycomedes, and Lyco my nephew. They themselves are to put at their head (the person) who they believe will persevere in attending to the business (of the school) and will be most capable of keeping it together. But the remaining members too are to assist in effecting this purpose both for my sake and that of the place.

“As for my funeral cortège and cremation, Bulo and Callinus are to take care of it together with my intimate friends, so as to ensure that it will be neither mean nor extravagant. From the (proceeds of the) groundplots¹⁵ in Aegina which have been mine, after my death Lyco is to make an allotment to the young men for (the purpose of) anointing with olive-oil, in order that through this use (of the oil) there will be remembrance both of me and of the person who has honored me,¹⁶ as is fitting. And he is also to set up a statue of me. As for the site, he is to consider it attentively, to ensure that it is suitable for the placing (of the statue), and Diophantus is to assist him and also Heraclides, son of Demetrius. Out of the (property) in town Lyco is to pay back to all, when he is present (at Athens), what I have previously received after his departure abroad.¹⁷ Bulo and Callinus are to provide both whatever will be spent on my funeral and the other customary rites. They are to recover those (expenses) out of the (property) that at home is left

¹⁴ On the use of the term *Peripatos* here see Gottschalk 1972, 333–5.

¹⁵ The Greek *meros* is taken here in the sense of ‘groundplot’ (cp. Thuc. 2.96.1; 4.98.4). Cobet’s conjecture would mean ‘sacred olive(tree)s’, which appears to be impossible here. Scaliger’s conjecture is not easier than the text as it stands.

¹⁶ Presumably this person is the younger Lyco, who by executing this request of Lyco, ‘honors’ him.

¹⁷ Apparently Lyco wrote his testament during a serious illness (l. 58), at a time the younger Lyco was abroad. The translation renders the text of the MSS.; usually Cobet is followed in reading ‘Lyco is to repay all from whom I have previously received something’.

- ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν οἴκῳ κοινῇ καταλειπομένων ἀμφοτέροις
 72 ὑπ' ἐμοῦ. τιμησάτω(σαν) δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἰατροὺς Πασίθε- 90
 μιν καὶ Μηδίαν, ἀξίους ὄντας καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν
 τὴν περὶ ἐμὲ καὶ τὴν τέχνην καὶ μείζονος ἔτι τιμῆς. δί-
 δωμι δὲ τῷ Καλλίνου παιδίῳ Θηρικλείων ζεῦγος καὶ
 τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ Ῥο(δ)ιακῶν ζεῦγος, ψιλοτάπιδα,
 ἀμφίταπον, περίστρωμα, προσκεφάλαια δύο τὰ βέλ- 95
 τιστα τῶν καταλειπομένων, ὥς ἂν ἐφ' ὅσον ἀνήκει
 πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ τούτων φανῶμεν μὴ ἀμνήμονες ὄντες.
 “περὶ δὲ τῶν θεραπευόντων ἐμαυτὸν οὕτως ἐξάγω·
 Δημητρίῳ μὲν ἐλευθέρῳ πάλαι ὄντι ἀφήμι τὰ λύτρα
 καὶ δίδωμι πέντε μνᾶς καὶ ἱμάτιον καὶ χιτῶνα, ἵνα 100
 πολλὰ πεπονηκῶς μετ' ἐμοῦ βίον εὐσχήμονα ἔχῃ. Κρί-
 τωνι δὲ Χαλκηδονίῳ καὶ τούτῳ τὰ λύτρα ἀφήμι καὶ
 δίδωμι τέτταρας μνᾶς. καὶ τὸν Μίκρον ἀφήμι ἐλεύθε-
 ρον· καὶ θρεψάτω Λύκων αὐτὸν καὶ παιδευσάτω ἀπὸ
 73 τοῦ νῦν χρόνου ἕξ ἔτη. καὶ Χάρητα ἀφήμι ἐλεύθερον· 105
 καὶ θρεψάτω Λύκων αὐτόν. καὶ δύο μνᾶς αὐτῷ δίδωμι
 καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ βιβλία τὰ ἀνεγνωσμένα· τὰ δὲ ἀνέκδοτα

92–6 δίδωμι—καταλειπομένων] *Suda* ρ 273 s.v. ῥοιάκες (LG 1.4. 304.25–6 Adler), *omisso* Θηρικλείων—αὐτοῦ 107–8 καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ βιβλία—ἐκδῶ] cf. 4.15–16

90 τιμησάτωσαν *Cobet*: τιμησάτω Ω 91 Μηδίαν *Menagius* (*Hübner, Comm. 1.649*): μειδίαν *BP*: μηδεῖαν *F* 93 Καλλινίκου *Suda* II Θηρικλείων *P⁴*: θηρακλείων *BP*: θηρικλεῖ *F* 94 Ῥο(δ)ιακῶν *D.J. van Lennep, ad Phalaridis Ep. p. 305 b*: ῥοιάκων Ω *et Suda*: ῥοίσκων *B²* 95–6 τὰ—καταλειπομένων] τῶν καλλίστων *Suda* 96 ὥς ἂν *PF*: ὅσον *B* 97 ἀμνήμονες ὄντες *BF*: ἀμνημονεύοντες *P* 103 Μίκρον *Hübner 2.732*: μικρὸν Ω

72 behind to both in common by me.¹⁸ They are also to remunerate the physicians Pasithemis and Medias, who because of both their assiduous care of me and their skill in fact deserve a still greater reward.¹⁹ I give to the child of Callinus a pair of Thericlean cups²⁰ and to his wife a pair of Rhodian vessels, a smooth carpet, a rug with pile on both sides, a bed cover, two pillows that are the best of the ones that are left behind, to make sure that in so far as appreciation is concerned, we will appear not to be forgetful of them either.

“With regard to the persons who waited upon me my directions are as follows. To Demetrius, being a free man a long time already, I remit the money to be paid for his manumission and I give (him) five minas and a cloak and a tunic, so that he will have a decent life after having worked with me for a long time. To Crito of Chalcedon, to him also I remit the money to be paid for his manumission and I give (him) four minas. And Micrus I set free. And Lyco is to maintain him and educate him during a period of six years from
73 this time. And Chares I set free and Lyco is to maintain him. And I give him two minas and those books of mine that have been (published by being) read aloud; the unpublished ones (I give) to

¹⁸ In ll. 62–3 the testament stipulates that the expenses of the funeral are to be paid out of the property left to the nephews Astyanax and Lyco ‘at home’. This favors taking ‘both’ as referring to the nephews Lyco and Astyanax (note the addition of ‘in common’); cp. Gottschalk 1972, 321 n.2. If, however, ‘both’ is taken to refer to Bulo and Callinus, the phrase ‘out of the property that at home is left behind to both in common by me’ would need to be taken in the sense that part of the property ‘at home’ in the Troad is to be ‘earmarked’ for Bulo and Callinus to pay the funeral expenses. See also note 19.

¹⁹ The interpretation of the text in ll. 84–90 is difficult. MS. B has a lacuna of 6 lines in ll. 82–8. In l. 86 the reading of the MSS. F and P (B is missing here) does not yield any sense and Cobet’s conjecture makes Bulo and Callinus responsible for the expenses of the funeral. As a consequence, Cobet ‘corrected’ the third person singular imperative of all MSS. (including B) in l. 88 and l. 90 into a third person plural, thus making Bulo and Callinus (instead of the Lyco mentioned in l. 85) the persons who are to recover the expenses made for the funeral out of the property ‘that at home is left behind to both in common by me’ (cp. note 18), and, what is more, the persons who are to pay the doctor’s bill. The *crux* lies in ll. 86–8, where the corruption of the text appears to go too deep to admit of any satisfactory solution.

²⁰ Thericlean cups were named after a Corinthian artisan of the 4th century B.C. and were well-known for their high quality of manufacture.

Καλλίνῳ, ὅπως ἐπιμελῶς αὐτὰ ἐκδῶ. δίδωμι δὲ καὶ
 Σύρῳ ἐλευθέρῳ ὄντι τέτταρας μνᾶς καὶ τὴν Μηνοδώ- 110
 ραν δίδωμι· καὶ εἴ τί μοι ὀφείλει, ἀφήμι αὐτῷ. καὶ
 Ἰλαρᾷ πέντε μνᾶς καὶ ἀμφίταπον καὶ περίστρωμα καὶ
 δύο προσκεφάλαια καὶ κλίνην ἣν ἂν βούληται. ἀφή-
 μι δὲ ἐλευθέραν καὶ τὴν τοῦ Μίκρου μητέρα καὶ Νοή-
 μονα καὶ Δίωνα καὶ Θέωνα καὶ Εὐφράνορα καὶ Ἑρ-
 μείαν. καὶ Ἀγάθωνα δύο ἔτη παραμείναντα ἀφεῖσθαι 115
 ἐλεύθερον· καὶ τοὺς φορεαφόρους Ὠφελίωνα καὶ Πο-
 74 σειδώνιον τέτταρα ἔτη παραμείναντας. δίδωμι δὲ καὶ
 Δημητρίῳ καὶ Κρίτωνι καὶ Σύρῳ κλίνην ἐκάστῳ καὶ
 στρώματα τῶν καταλειπομένων, ἃ ἂν φαίνεται Λύκ-
 ωνι καλῶς ἔχειν. ταῦτα ἔστω αὐτοῖς ἀποδείξασιν ὁρ- 120
 θῶς ἐφ' ὧν ἕκαστοι τεταγμένοι εἰσί.

“περὶ δὲ τῆς ταφῆς ἐάν τε αὐτοῦ βούληται Λύκων
 θάπτειν, ἐάν τε ἐν οἴκῳ, οὕτω ποιείτω. πέπεισμαι γὰρ
 αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ἦττον ἐμοῦ συνορᾶν τὸ εὐσχημον. ταῦτα
 δὲ πάντα οἰκονομήσαντι κυρία ἔστω ἡ δόσις τῶν ἐν- 125
 ταῦθα. μάρτυρες Καλλῖνος Ἑρμιονεύς, Ἀρίστων Κεῖ-
 ος, Εὐφρόνιος Παιανιεύς.”

οὕτω μέντοι αὐτῷ συνετῶς τὰ πάντα πράττοντι τὰ
 τε περὶ παιδείαν καὶ πάντας λόγους, οὐδὲν ἦττον καὶ
 τὰ τῶν διαθηκῶν τρόπον τινὰ καὶ σφόδρα ἐπιμελῶς 130
 τε καὶ οἰκονομικῶς ἴσχει· ὥστε κἀνταῦθα ζηλωτέος.

126–7 *Aristo F 5 Wehrli* 129 περὶ παιδείαν] cf. 7.6; 8.2–3; 16
 131 οἰκονομικῶς] cf. 8.14–24

110 αὐτῷ *BF*: αὐτόν *P* 113 Μίκρου *Hübner* 2.732: μικροῦ *Ω*
 126 ἐρμίων· εὐσαρίστων *B* 128 συνετῶς τὰ *P*: συνεστῶτα *B*,
 -τι *F*

2 Plutarchus, *De exilio* 14 605A–C (BT 3.525.23–526.15 Paton et al.)

- 14 εἰ δὲ φήσει τις ὅτι δόξαν οὗτοι καὶ τιμὰς ἐθήρευον,
 ἐπὶ τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐλθεῖ καὶ τὰς σοφὰς Ἀθήνησι σχολὰς
 καὶ διατριβάς· ἀναπέμπασαι τὰς ἐν Λυκείῳ τὰς ἐν
 1 W Ἀκαδημείᾳ τὴν Στοὰν τὸ Παλλάδιον τὸ Ὠιδεῖον. εἰ
 τὴν Περιπατητικὴν ἀσπάζη μάλιστα καὶ τεθαύμακ- 5
 B ας, Ἀριστοτέλης ἦν ἐκ Σταγίρων, Θεόφραστος ἐξ Ἑρέ-

Callinus, that he may publish them carefully.²¹ I also give to Syrus, being a free man, four minas and Menodora; and if he owes me any debt, I remit (it) to him. And to Hilara (I give) five minas and a rug with pile on both sides and a bed cover and two pillows and whichever bed she wants. And I also set free the mother of Micrus and Noemo and Dio and Theo and Euphranor and Hermias. And (I direct) that Agatho is to be set free after having stayed in service for two years; and also the litter-bearers Ophelio and Posidonius
74 after having stayed in service for four years. I also give to Demetrius and to Crito and to Syrus each a bed and bed sheets out of the ones that are left behind, whichever will appear to Lyco to be appropriate. These things are to be theirs for having performed correctly the tasks to which each has been appointed.

“With regard to my burial,²² Lyco is to do as he wishes, whether he prefers to bury (me) here or at home. For I am convinced that he, no less than I, has an eye for what is decent. When he has administered all these things, the gift of the property here is to take effect. Witnesses (are) Callinus of Hermione, Aristo of Ceos, Euphronius of Paeania.”

Thus (it may) truly (be said that), while he handled all things in the field of education and all his utterances in an intelligent manner, the affairs of his will, too, are in a way no less marked even by the highest attention and administration, so that in this, too, he is to be emulated.

²¹ On the difference between ‘published by being read aloud’ and ‘unpublished’, see T. Dorandi, *Le Style et la Tablette*, 2000, 104–5.

²² Directions as to the funeral cortège (ἐκφορά) and cremation (καῦσις) are given in ll. 62 and 75–7; ll. 122–3 concern the burial (τάφῃ) of the ashes.

2 Plutarch, *On Exile* 14 605A–C (BT 3.525.23–526.15 Paton et al.)

14 And if anyone will say that these men were chasing after renowned and honors,¹ go to the wise men and the wise schools and seminars at Athens.² Consider those in the Lyceum, those in the Academy, consider the Stoa, the Palladium, the Odeum.³ If you
B embrace and admire the Peripatetic school most, Aristotle was from Stagira, Theophrastus from Eresus, Strato from Lampsacus,

σου, Στράτων ἐκ Λαμψάκου, Λύκων ἐκ Τρωάδος, Ἀρί-
 στων ἐκ Κέω, Κριτόλαος Φασηλίτης· εἰ τὴν Στωικὴν,
 Ζήνων Κιτιεύς, Κλεάνθης Ἀσσιος, Χρύσιππος Σολεύς,
 Διογένης Βαβυλώνιος, Ἀντίπατρος Ταρσεύς, ὁ δ' Ἀθ- 10
 ηναῖος Ἀρχέδημος εἰς τὴν Πάρθων μεταστὰς ἐν Βαβυ-
 λῶνι Στωικὴν διαδοχὴν ἀπέλιπε. τίς οὖν τούτους ἐδίω-
 ξεν; οὐδεὶς· ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ διώκοντες ἡσυχίαν, ἥς οὐ πά-
 νυ μέτεστιν οἴκοι τοῖς ἡντιναοῦν δόξαν ἢ δύναμιν
 ἔχουσι, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα λόγοις τοῦτο δ' ἔργοις ἡμᾶς διδ- 15
 άσκουσι. καὶ γὰρ νῦν οἱ δοκιμώτατοι καὶ κράτιστοι
 ζῶσιν ἐπὶ ξένης οὐ μετασταθέντες ἀλλὰ μεταστάντες
 οὐδὲ φυγαδευθέντες ἀλλὰ φυγόντες αὐτοὶ πράγματα
 καὶ περισπασμοὺς καὶ ἀσχολίας, ἅς αἱ πατρίδες φέρ-
 ουνσι. 20

1–16 *Thphr. no. 25 FHS&G* 6–17 Ἀριστοτέλης—μεταστάντες]
Stob. Anth. 3.40.3/4 (3.736.8–737.4 Hense), *omisso* 8–12 Κριτόλα-
 ος—ἀπέλιπε 6–8 *Critolaus F 1 Wehrli; IK 53 (1997) T 169.5 p. 251*
 7–8 *Aristo F 3 Wehrli* 7 *Strato F 4, 1 Wehrli* || Λύκων] *cf. ad 1.2* ||
 ἐκ Τρωάδος] *v. ad 1.2* 9 Ζήνων] *cf. D.L. 7.1 = Zeno F 1 SVF 1.3* ||
 Κλεάνθης] *cf. D.L. 7.168 = Cleanth. F 463 SVF 1.103* || Χρύσιππος]
cf. D.L. 7.179 = Chrysipp. F 1 SVF 2.1 10 Διογένης] *Diog. Bab.*
F 2 SVF 3.210 || Ἀντίπατρος] *Antip. F 6 SVF 3.244* 11 Ἀρ-
 χέδημος] *Arched. F 2 SVF 3.262* 16–20 *cf. Muson. p. 43,8–16*

[*J(pars alt.)v(w)αΑΕβ; n = Neapol. Gr. 350 III E 28 + Vat. Gr. 1676;*
Ald.² = notae Leonici margini Aldinae Hamburgensis adscriptae]
 6–7 ἐφέσου *codd.*, *corr. editio Aldina Basileensis 1542* : ἐρεσίου *Stob.*
 7 Λύκων] γλύκων *codd.*, *corr. Xylander* : γλαύκων δὲ *Stob.* 8 εἰ *n* :
 εἰς *cett.* 9 Ἀσσιος] λύδιος *codd.*, *corr. Ald.²* 13 ἡσυχίαν καὶ
 σπουδὴν *Stob.* 15 δ' ἔργοις ἡμᾶς] δὲ ἡμᾶς ἔργῳ *Stob.*

3A Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 1.14 63.5 (GCS 2.40.9–12 Stählin-Früchtel)

1¹ W 5 παρὰ Πλάτωνι Ἀριστοτέλης φιλοσοφῆσας μετελ-
 θὼν εἰς τὸ Λύκειον κτίζει τὴν Περιπατητικὴν αἵρεσιν.
 τοῦτον διαδέχεται Θεόφραστος, ὃν Στράτων, ὃν Λύκ-
 ων, εἶτα Κριτόλαος, εἶτα Διόδωρος.

1–2 *cf. Arist. F 3 Düring p. 260* 3–4 *Thphr. no. 11.5 FHS&G =*
Strato F 4 Wehrli = Critolaus F 4 Wehrli = Diodorus Tyrius F 1 Wehrli
 || ὃν Λύκων] *v. ad 1.2*

Lyco from the Troad, Aristo from Ceos, Critolaus was a Phaselian; if (you favor) the Stoic school, Zeno (was) from Citium, Cleanthes from Assos, Chrysippus from Soli, Diogenes from Babylon, Antipater from Tarsus, and the Athenian Archedemus moved to the land of the Parthians and left behind him a succession of Stoics in Babylon. Who pursued these men? No one. It was they themselves who pursued quiet,⁴ which no one possessing any renown or power at all has a share in at home; this is what they teach us, not by their words as other things, but by their actions. For in our time too the most highly esteemed and powerful men live on C foreign soil, not because they have been moved but because they themselves have moved, nor because they have been made refugees but because they themselves have fled the troubles and distractions and pressing business, which their home lands yield.

¹ In chapter 13 Plutarch has mentioned a number of literary figures who of their own free will either left Athens or came to it from their home country: Euripides went to Macedon; Aeschylus and Simonides to Sicily; Herodotus to Thurii; and what about Homer?

² For the distinction between *scholê* and *diatribê* see J. Glucker, *Antiochus*, 1978, 160–6.

³ Clitomachus held his private ‘school’ in the Palladium (Phld. *Acad. Hist.* col. 24.32–6; 25.8–11; 30.8–10); Chrysippus sometimes lectured in the Odeum (D.L. 7.184).

⁴ Plutarch appears to be exploiting an ambiguity in the word διώκειν. In the first occurrence, we should think of a legal action, bringing an indictment. In the second, the legal sense has been dropped; the verb is used of simple pursuit.

3A Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.14 63.5 (GCS 2.40.9–12 Stählin-Früchtel)

5 After having studied philosophy with Plato, Aristotle moved to the Lyceum and founded the Peripatetic school.¹ His successor is Theophrastus, that of Theophrastus Strato, that of Strato Lyco, then (comes) Critolaus, then Diodorus.²

¹ On the term *hairesis* as distinct from *scholê* and *diatribê* (cp. 2 note 2) see J. Glucker, *Antiochus*, 1978, 166–92.

² On the different lists of scholars of the Peripatos see Brink 1940, 908–14.

3B *Vita Aristotelis Hesychii* 9 (p. 82.18–21 Düring)

6 W διάδοχοι δ' αὐτοῦ τῆς σχολῆς κατὰ τάξιν ἐγένοντο οἶδε· Θεόφραστος, Στράτων, Πραξιτέλης, Λύκων, Ἀρ-
ίστων, Λυκίσκος, Πραξιφάνης, Ἱερώνυμος, Πρύτανις,
Φορμίων, Κριτόλαος.

= *Vita Aristotelis Menagiana* p. 402.20–3 Westermann = *Arist. Fragmenta* p. 10.19–22 Rose = *Gigon* p. 26a.33–6 1–4 *Strato* F 3 Wehrli = *Aristo* F 7 Wehrli = *Hieronym.* F 3A White, F 2 Wehrli = *Critolaus* F 3 Wehrli = *Praxiphanes* F 3 Wehrli 2 Λύκων] v. ad 3A.3–4 || Πραξιτέλης] cf. *D.L.* 5.52 (= *Praxiteles* *RE* 22.2 (1954) 1808 no. 6) 3 Πρύτανις] *RE* 23.1 (1957) 1158 no. 5; cf. *R. Kassel, ZPE* 60 (1985) 23–4 [= *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin & New York 1991, 351–2] 4 Φορμίων] *RE* 20.1 (1941) 540 no. 8

4 *Diogenes Laertius, Vitae philosophorum* 5.61–4 (BT 1.352.14–354.13 Marcovich)

τοῦ δ' οὖν φυσικοῦ φέρονται καὶ διαθῆκαι τοῦτον ἔχουσαι τὸν τρόπον·

“τάδε διατίθεται, ἐάν τι πάσχω. τὰ μὲν οἴκοι καταλείπω πάντα Λαμπυρίωνι καὶ Ἀρκεσίλαῳ. ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἀθήνησιν ὑπάρχοντός μοι ἀργυρίου πρῶτον μὲν 5 οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν ἐκφορὰν ἐπιμεληθήτωσαν καὶ ὅσα νομίζεται μετὰ τὴν ἐκφορὰν, μηθὲν μῆτε περί-
62 εργον ποιοῦντες μῆτ' ἀνελεύθερον. ἐπιμεληταὶ δὲ ἔστωσαν τῶν κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην οἶδε· Ὀλύμπιχος, Ἀρι-
τείδης, Μνησιγένης, Ἱποκράτης, Ἐπικράτης, Γοργύ- 10
λος, Διοκλῆς, Λύκων, Ἀθάνις.

4 W “καταλείπω δὲ τὴν μὲν διατριβὴν Λύκωνι, ἐπειδὴ τῶν ἄλλων οἱ μὲν εἰσι πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ δὲ ἄσχολοι. κα-
λῶς δ' ἂν ποιοῖεν καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ συγκατασκευάζοντες τούτῳ. καταλείπω δ' αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ βιβλία πάντα, πλὴν 15
ὧν αὐτοὶ γεγράφαμεν, καὶ τὰ σκεύη πάντα κατὰ τὸ συσ-
σίτιον καὶ τὰ στρώματα καὶ τὰ ποτήρια.

“δότησαν δὲ οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ Ἐπικράτει πεντακοσί-
ας δραχμὰς καὶ τῶν παίδων ἓνα, ὃν ἂν δοκῇ Ἀρκεσίλ-
63 αῷ. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν Λαμπυρίων καὶ Ἀρκεσίλαος ἀρά- 20
σθωσαν τὰς συνθήκας ἃς ἔθετο Δάϊππος ὑπὲρ Ἡραί-

3B *Life of Aristotle by Hesychius* 9 (p. 82.18–21 Düring)

Those who inherited the school from him (Aristotle) were, one after the other, the following: Theophrastus, Strato, Praxiteles, Lyco, Aristo, Lyciscus, Praxiphanes, Hieronymus, Prytanis, Phormio, Critolaus.¹

¹ See **3A** note 2.

4 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 5.61–4 (BT 1.352.14–354.13 Marcovich)¹

Now, of the natural philosopher (Strato) a will is also in circulation, which reads as follows:²

“These are my dispositions, in case anything happens to me. All my property at home³ I leave to Lampyrio and Arcesilaus.⁴ Out of the silver-money being at my disposal at Athens, in the first place my executors are to take care of matters connected with my funeral cortège and of all that custom requires to be done after the funeral cortège, without doing anything either extravagant on the
62 one hand or mean on the other. Executors of the dispositions as contained in my will are to be the following (persons): Olympichus, Aristides, Mnesigenes, Hippocrates, Epicrates, Gorgylus, Diocles, Lyco, Athanis.

“I leave the seminar⁵ to Lyco, since of the rest some are too old and others too busy. But the others too would do well by providing him with assistance. I also leave to him all my books, except those which we ourselves have written, and all the furniture in the dining-room, the coverings and the drinking-cups.

“The executors are to give Epicrates five hundred drachmas and
63 one of the slaves whom Arcesilaus shall deem fit. And in the first place Lampyrio and Arcesilaus are to cancel the agreement which Daïppus has entered into on behalf of Heraeus. And he (Daïppus)

ου· καὶ μηθὲν ὀφειλέτω μήτε Λαμπυρίωνι μήτε τοῖς
 Λαμπυρίωνος κληρονόμοις, ἀλλ' ἀπηλλάχθω παντὸς
 τοῦ συμβολαίου. δότωσαν δ' αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ ἐπιμεληταὶ
 ἀργυρίου πεντακοσίας δραχμὰς καὶ τῶν παίδων ἕνα, 25
 ὃν ἂν δοκιμάζη Ἀρκεσίλαος, ὅπως ἂν πολλὰ συμπε-
 πονηκῶς ἡμῖν καὶ παρεσχημένος χρείας ἔχη βίον ἱκα-
 νὸν καὶ εὐσχημονῇ.

“ἀφίημι δὲ καὶ Διόφαντον ἐλεύθερον καὶ Διοκλέα
 καὶ Ἀβουν· Σιμίαν δὲ ἀποδίδωμι Ἀρκεσιλάῳ. ἀφίη- 30
 μι δὲ καὶ Δρόμωνα ἐλεύθερον.

“ἐπειδὴν δὲ παραγένηται Ἀρκεσίλαος, λογισάσθω
 Ἡραῖος μετ' Ὀλυμπίχου καὶ Ἐπικράτους καὶ τῶν ἄλ-
 λων ἐπιμελητῶν τὸ γεγονὸς ἀνάλωμα εἰς τὴν ἐκφορὰν
 64 καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ νομιζόμενα. τὸ δὲ περιὸν ἀργύριον 35
 κομισάσθω Ἀρκεσίλαος παρὰ Ὀλυμπίχου, μηθὲν ἐν-
 οχλῶν αὐτὸν κατὰ τοὺς καιροὺς καὶ τοὺς χρόνους·
 ἀράσθω δὲ καὶ τὰς συνθήκας Ἀρκεσίλαος ἃς ἔθετο
 Στράτων πρὸς Ὀλύμπιχον καὶ Ἀμεινίαν, τὰς κειμένας
 παρὰ Φιλοκράτει Τεισαμενοῦ. τὰ δὲ περὶ τὸ μνημεῖον 40
 ποιεῖτωσαν ὡς ἂν δοκῇ Ἀρκεσιλάῳ καὶ Ὀλυμπίχῳ
 καὶ Λύκωνι.”

καὶ αἶδε μὲν εἰσιν αἱ φερόμεναι αὐτοῦ διαθήκαι,
 καθά που συνήγαγε καὶ Ἀρίστων ὁ Κεῖος.

1–44 *Strato F 10 Wehrli*; v. ad 1.55–127 8–15 *IK 53 (1997) T 169.8*
p. 251–2 12–15 καταλείπω—τούτῳ] cf. 1.67–74 12 κατα-
 λείπω—Λύκωνι] cf. 1.42–4 et v. ad 1.2 15–16 καταλείπω—γε-
 γράφαμεν] cf. 1.107–8 43–4 *Aristo F 31 Wehrli*

v. *conspicuum siglorum ad 1* [*D = Neapolitanus Bourbonicus III B 28*]
 5 μοι *om. B* 7 μήτε *BP*: τι *F* 9 οὐλυμπικός *Ω*: corr. *Hübner*
 (cf. 33) 11 ἀθάνης *P* 15 τούτῳ *F*: τοῦτο *BP* 16 κατὰ *BP*:
 καὶ *F* 19 ἕνα *BP*: ἕνεκα *F* 20 καὶ¹ *Menagius*: δὲ *PF*: *om. B*
 21 διέθετο *F* 22 ὀφειλέτω *F*: ὀφείλετο *BP* 25–6 ἕνα ὃν ἂν
D: ἔνδον ἐὰν *B*: ἕνα ὃν ἐὰν *P*: ἕνα ἐὰν *F* 27 παρεσχόμενος *F*
 28 εὐσχημονῇ *BF*: εὐσχίμων ἦ *P*: εὐσχίμονα *Cobet* 36–7 ὀχλῶν
F 37 τοὺς *om. F* 40 τεισαμένου *B*: τισαμενοῦ *F*: τισαμένου
P: † Τεῖσαμένου † (*sic*) *Wehrli*

is not to owe any debt either to Lampyrio or to the heirs of Lampyrio, but is to be released from the entire contract. The executors are also to give him five hundred drachmas in silver-money and one of the slaves whom Arcesilaus shall deem fit, to ensure that thus, after having shared many troubles with me and having rendered many services, he will have the means to maintain himself and live in a decent way.

“I also set free Diophantus, Diocles and Abus; Simias I give back to Arcesilaus. I also set free Dromo.

“As soon as Arcesilaus has arrived, Heraeus, together with Olympichus and Epicrates and the other executors, is to calculate the expenses which have been incurred regarding the funeral
64 cortège and the other customary rites. And the silver-money that remains (after the payment of these expenses) Arcesilaus is to recover from Olympichus, without pressing him in any way as to exact times and dates (of payment). Arcesilaus is also to cancel the agreement which was entered into by Strato with Olympichus and Ameinias and deposited with Philocrates the son of Tisamenus. With regard to the matter of my monument they are to act as Arcesilaus and Olympichus and Lyco shall deem fit.”

And this is the will which is in circulation of him, according to the collection as made by Aristo of Ceos.

¹ Cp. 1 note 1. This passage is part of the *Life* of Strato. Strato's testament is quoted in full to facilitate comparison with Lyco's testament in 1.55–127.

² On the testament of Strato see Sollenberger 1992, 3869–70; Gottschalk 1972, 320–1; Bruns 1880, 37–41 [= *KS* 223–7]; Dareste 1882, 12–14; Schulin 1882; Hug 1887, 7–9; 13; 16.

³ I.e., in Lampsacus; cp. Sollenberger 1992, 3869.

⁴ Lampyrio and Arcesilaus probably were Strato's nephews, because Strato's father was called Arcesilaus too (D.L. 5.58); cp. Gottschalk 1972, 318.

⁵ On *diatribê* see 2 note 2.

5 *Inscriptiones Graecae* II² 791 + *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 287–92
no. 56 = *SEG* 32.118, 1–32 & 71 (a. 243)

- a** ταμίας στρατιω[τικῶν]
Εὐρυκλείδης Μικίωνος [Κηφισιεύς]
[ἐ]πὶ Διομέδοντος ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς [Δημη[τριάδος] δεκάτης πρ]-
υτανείας, ἥι Φορυσκίδης Ἀριστομένου Ἀ[λωπεκῆθεν ἐγραμμά]-
[τε]υεν· ὃν Ἐλαφβολίωνος ἐνεί καὶ νέαι ἐμ[βολίμωι, δευτέραι τ]- 5
[ῆς] πρυτανείας· ἐκκλησία· τῶν προέδρων ἐ[πεψήφισεν Καλλίς]-
[τρ]ατος Τελεσίνου Ἐρχι[ῆς κ]αὶ συμ[πρόεδροι]· *vacat*
- b** ἔδοξεν τῶι δήμωι·
[Θε]όφημος Τιμοκλέους Μαραθώνιος εἶπε[ν· ὅπως ἂν χρημάτων]
[π]ορισθέντων ἔχει ὁ ταμίας μερίζειν τὰ [δεόμενα, ἴνα κατὰ τὸ]- 10
[ν κ]ατάλοιπον χρόνον τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ συνκ[ομισθῶσιν οἱ ἐκ γῆς]
[κ]αρποὶ μετ' ἀσφαλείας· ὃ ἀγαθεῖ τύχει δε[δόχθαι τῇ βουλευί·]
[τ]οὺς λαχόντας προέδρους εἰς τὴν ἐπιού[σ]αν ἐκκλησίαν χρημ- *e*
[α]τίσαι περὶ τούτων, γνώμην δὲ ξυμβάλλε[σθαι τῆς βουλῆς, ὅτι
δοκεῖ τῇ βουλευί, τούτους βουλομένους τῶ[ν] πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλ- 15
λων τῶν οἰκούντων ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπιδιδό[να]ι εἰς τὴν σωτηρία-
ν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῆς χώρας ἐ[ν] τῶι δήμωι ἢ ἐν τῇ β-
ουλεῖ ἢ πρὸς τοὺς στρατηγούς ἀπογραψα[μ]ένους μέχρι τοῦ Μο-
υνιχίωνος· μὴ ἐξέστω δὲ μηθενὶ ἐπιδου[να]ι πλέον ΗΗ^ν δραχμῶν
μηδ' ἔλαττον ὃ^ν· εἶναι δὲ τοῖς ἐπιδου[σι]ν κ[αὶ] κοινεῖ καὶ ιδία- 20
ι ἐπαινεθῆναι καὶ τιμηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου καθότι ἂν εἰ ἄξι-
ος ἕκαστος αὐτῶν· τὸν δὲ γραμματέα τοῦ δήμου ἀναγράψαι τό-
[δ]ε τὸ ψήφισμα καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἐπιδόντ[ων] ἐν στίλει λιθίν-
ει κ[α]ὶ στήσαι ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ ὅπως ἂν φανερ[ᾷ] ἢ ἅπασιν ἢ φιλοτ-
c ιμῖα τῶν βουλομένων εὐεργετῆν τ[ὸν] δῆμ[ον]· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα τ- 25
ὸ γενόμενον εἰς τε τὴν στήλην καὶ τὴν ἀ[ναγ]ραφὴν τῶν ὀνομάτ-
ων μερίσαι τὸν ἐπὶ τῇ διοικήσει· τὸ δὲ ψή[φ]ισμα τόδε, ἐπειδὴ
περὶ πόρου χρημάτων ἐστὶν στρατιωτικῶ[ν, ἅπαν] εἶναι εἰς φυ-
λακὴν τῆς χώρας. *vacat*
- 13 W οἵδε ἐπέδωκαν εἰς τὴν σω[τ]ηρίαν τῆς π[ό]- 30
λεως καὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῆς [χ]ώρας κατὰ τ[ὸ]
ψήφισμα τοῦ δήμου. *vacat*
Ἀντιφῶν Ἐρχι ΗΗ Δρακοντίδης Ἐρχι ΗΗ [-] κλη[ῖς Σ]φήτ [--] 33

...

...

...

5 *Inscriptiones Graecae* II² 791 + *Hesperia* 11 (1942) 287–92 no. 56
= *SEG* 32.118, 1–32 & 71 (243 B.C.)¹

a The Controller of the Mili[tary] Funds
Euryclides, son of Micio, [of Kephisia]

During the archonship of Diomedon,² in the [tenth pr]ytany [of the tribe
Demetrias],³ for which Phoryscides, son of Aristomenes, from A[lope- 5
ke], was [secret]ary; on the last day, in[tercalated], of the month Ela-
phebolion,⁴ [on the second day of the] prytany; (meeting of the) As-
sembly (of the people): of the presiding officers [Callistr]atus, son of
Telesinus, of Erchia, and his joint-[presidents put to the vote]:

b The People have decided:

[The]ophemus, son of Timocles, of Marathon, made the proposal: [In 10
order that, money] having been provided, the controller has the means
to allot the [necessary funds to ensure that during th]e remaining time of
the year [the] produce [of the land be] gath[ered] in safely: with good
fortune [the Council has] de[cided] that the presiding officers appoint-
ed by lot shall bring this matter before the next Assembly, and *e*
communicate the opinion of the Council, viz. that it pleases the Council
that those of the citizens and other residents of the city⁵ who want to 15
(do so), shall make a contribution for the safeguarding of the city and the
protection of the territory, after having registered in the People's
Assembly or in the Council or with the *strategoí* by the month of Mou-
nychion (at the latest); it is not to be allowed to anyone to contribute 20
more than 200 drachmas but not less than 50 either; that it will be al-
lowed to the contributors to be praised and honored, both publicly and
privately, by the People as each one of them deserves; that the secretary
of the People shall inscribe this decree and the names of the contribu-
c tors on a slab (*stele*) of stone and place it in the *agora*, in order that the
generosity of those who are willing to do well to the People shall be
manifest to all; that the officer in charge of financial administration 25
shall allot whatever expenditure there will be made towards the *stele* and
the inscribing of the names; and that this decree, since it concerns the
provision of military funds, is [wholly] for the protection of the terri-
tory.

The following persons have made a contribution for the safe- 30
guarding of the city and the protection of the territory accord-
ing to the decree of the People:⁶

Antiphon of Erchia 200 Dracontides of Erchia 200 –cles of Sphettos – – 33

...

...

...

13 W Λύκων φιλόσο HH Θεόπομπος Λαμπτρ HH Θουκρ[ιτ — — — —] 71

... ...

‘DE CONFERENDIS STIPIBUS ADIECTO LATERCULO ΤΩΝ ΕΠΙΔΟΝΤΩΝ.
Ad parietinas aedis Hypapantes (in antiquo foro), nunc in museo nat.
Fragmenta quattuor stelae marmoris Hymettii fastigio ornatae ... Fr.
a+b+c nunc conglutinata a. 0,66, l. 0,26, cr. 0,14. Fr. *d* a. 0,41, l. 0,33,
cr. 0,07’ (*IG II² 791*) || *a+b+c+d* edd. A.R. Rangabé, *Antiquités
Helléniques II*, 1855, no. 880 p. 566–71; U. Köhler *IG II 334*; J.
Kirchner *SIG 491 et IG II² 791 + Addenda* p. 667 || ‘The decree pub-
lished as *I.G.*, II², 791 is augmented by two new pieces of Hymettian
marble. ... *e*: Height, 0.336 m.; width, 0.155 m.; thickness, 0.077 m. ...
f: Height, 0.236 m.; width, 0.201 m.; thickness, 0.065 m.’ (*Hesperia II*
(1942) 287) || *a+b+c+d+e+f* edd. B.D. Meritt, *Hesperia II* (1942) 287–
92 no. 56 (phot. 288–9); *SEG 32.118* || 1–32 edd. Ch. Pélékidis,
Μελέτες ἀρχαίας ιστορίας, 1979, 42–5; L. Migeotte, *Les souscriptions
publiques dans les cités grecques*, 1992, 28–34 no. 17; 9–32 ed. A.
Kuenzi, *Epidosis*, 1923, 11–13 || *stoichedon 48* || *suppl. Rangabé et
Köhler* 2 Εὐρυκλείδης] *PA 5966*; cf. *SEG 32.119* 30–2 *IK 53*
(1997) *T 169.2* p. 250 71 *IK 53* (1997) *T 169.2* p. 250 || Λύκων
φιλόσο] cf. *D.L. 7.12 de Zenone*

2 [Κηφισιεύς] cf. 34 Μικίων Κηφισι 3 [Δημη[τριάδος] *S.B.*
Aleshire, ZPE 64 (1986) 82 || δεκάτης *Köhler* 4 ‘Α[λωπεκῆθεν] *J.H.*
Kroll, Hesperia 46 (1977) 121 no. 54: ‘Α[ναγυράσιος] *Meritt* 5
δευτέραι *G.F. Unger, Philologus Suppl. 5* (1889) 709 6 *pro*
ἐ[πεψήφισεν] *Köhler* ἐ[πεψήφισζεν] *Meritt litterarum numeri causa*
6–7 [Καλλίστρ]ατος *Köhler coll. IG II² 678,28 (PA 8165)* 10
[δεόμενα]: δέοντα” *aut ἀναγκαῖα Pélékidis*

6 *Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes* IV 63 (a. 244/3—239/8)

[ἐπὶ^{ca. 10} ἄρχοντος, ἱερομνημονούντων· Αἰτωλῶν] 1
[. . .]νέα, Κλευπάτρου, Νικομά[χου, *nomen, nomen*]
[. . ., Κ]αλλιξένου, Κλέωνος, Εὐφα[ν , *nomen*· Χίων . . .]
[.ο]ς· Δελφῶν Ἐπαρμόστου, Αὐτολύ[κου?· Βοιωτῶν *nomen*,]
14 W [. . .]ωνος· ἐπειδὴ Λύκων Ἀστυάνακ[τος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς] 5
[ἐ]ξ Αἰολίδος πᾶσαν εὐνοίαν καὶ φι[λοτιμίαν ἔχων διατε]-
[λε]ῖ πρὸς τε τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐν Δ[ελφοῖς καὶ τὸ κοινὸν]
[τῶ]ν Ἀμφικτυόνων, ἔδοξε τοῖς ἱερομνή[οσι στεφανῶσαι]

Lyco philoso(pher)⁷ 200 Theopompus of Lamptrai 200 Thucr[it— — — 71

...

...

...

¹ On this inscription see W.S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, 1911, 203–4; A. Kuenzi, *ΕΠΙΔΟΣΙΣ. Sammlung freiwilliger Beiträge zu Zeiten der Not in Athen*, 1923, 11–13; P.J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule*, 1972, 231–5; Ch. Pélékidis, *Μελέτες ἀρχαίας ιστορίας [Études d'Histoire Ancienne]*, 1979, 33–60; L. Migeotte, *Les souscriptions publiques dans les cités grecques*, 1992, 28–34 no. 17; Chr. Habicht, *Studien*, 26–33; *GA*, 241; *Athen*, 165–6.

² On the dating of the inscription, which depends on the archonship of Diomedon, see L. Migeotte, *Les souscriptions*, 30 with n. 52 (April 243), Chr. Habicht, *Studien*, 28 (March/April 243). On the dating of Diomedon, see Habicht, *Studien*, 113–46, who dates his archonship to 244/3 (p. 143). S.V. Tracy, *Hesperia* 57 (1988) 319 assigns the lettering of the inscription to the cutter of *IG II*² 788, ca. 255–253/4 B.C.

³ The name of the prytanizing tribe was deliberately erased; see W.B. Dinsmoor, *The Archons of Athens in the Hellenistic Age*, 1931, 95–7.

⁴ The decree was passed in the Assembly on the last day of the month Elaphebolion (I. 5), which corresponds to mid-April. The contributions had to be registered during the following month of Mounychion at the latest (II. 18–19); obviously, the matter was urgent.

⁵ I.e., *metics*.

⁶ A list of contributors follows in three columns (II. 33–81); there is a lacuna between fragments *a+b+c+e* and *d+f* (after I. 41) with c. 11–22 lines missing (see Habicht, *Studien*, 31 and L. Migeotte, *Souscriptions*, 30). On the part which has been preserved col. I contains 46, col. II 44/45, and col. III 41 names of contributors. In the case of 83 contributors the amount of the donation is preserved: 73 donations of 200, 8 of 100, and 2 of 50 drachmas.

⁷ As to Lyco's position in Athens, it is relevant to note with Chr. Habicht, *Studien*, 33, that the list of contributors contains the names of citizens who were not only well-to-do but also politically active, and that no less than seven have names known in the period 263–229 as names of eponymous archons.

6 *Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes* IV 63 (a. 244/3–239/8)¹

[During the archonship of — —,² while the *hieromnemones* were:³ of the Aetolians . . .]neas, Cleupatrus, Nicoma[chus, name, name, C]allixenus, Cleon, Eupha[n ... , name, of the Chians ... u]s, of the Delphians Eparmostus, Autol[ycus?], of the Boeotians name, ...]on: Since Lyco, son of Astyanax, [from 5 Alexandria]⁴ from Aeolis, is [unremittingly showing] all manner of goodwill and ge[nerosity] towards the god and the sanctuary in D[elphi and the Council] of the Amphictyony, the *hieromnemones* have decided [that they shall crown] Lyco with

[Λύ]κωνα δάφνης στεφάνωι παρὰ τοῦ θεο[ῦ, καὶ ὑπάρχειν? τὴν]
 [πα]ρὰ τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων δεδομένην αὐ[τῶι προδικίαν καὶ] 10
 [ἄσυ]λίαν ἀπὸ πάντων καὶ πολέμου καὶ εἰρή[νης καὶ ἀσφάλει]-
 [αν] καὶ ἀτέλειαν καὶ προεδρίαν ἐμ[πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγῶσιν]
 [οἷ]ς τιθέασιν Ἀμφικτύονες· ἀναγ[ράψαι δὲ καὶ τὸ ψήφι]-
 [σ]μα τότε τοὺς ἱερομνήμονας ἐν [τῶι ἱερῶι τοῦ Ἀπόλ]-
 λωνος. 15

‘Inv. 3151. Trésor de Cyrène, face nord de l’ante nord, premier bloc au-dessus de l’orthostate.’ (*CID IV 63 = Documents Amphictioniques. Par F. Lefèvre, avec une Note d’architecture par D. Laroche et des Notes d’onomastique par O. Masson, Paris 2002, 177–9*) a. 0,30, l. 0,40, cr. 0,31 (cf. *Pomtow, RE Suppl. 4 (1924) 1390; FD II pl. XVII, 4 et L, 7*) || ed. pr. A. Jardé, *BCH 26 (1902) 262–3 no. 12 [= BCH]; iterum edd. H. Pomtow, GGA 175.3 (1913) 167–70 no. 1 [= GGA]; Klio, 14 (1915) 308 [= Klio]; et SIG (1915) no. 461 [= SIG]; G. Daux et A. Salac, *FD III 3 (1932) 139–40 no. 167 [= FD]; F. Lefèvre, CID IV 63 [= CID] || 1–5 ed. R. Flacelière, BCH 53 (1929) 449–50 no. 30 (cf. *Les Aitolians à Delphes, Paris 1937, no. 30 p. 402–3*) || suppl. Jardé 5–15 IK 53 (1997) T 169.1 p. 250 5–8 cf. 1.26–7 5 Ἀστυάνακ[τος] cf. 1.2**

1 suppl. *Pomtow, Klio et SIG* 2 [Φαι]νέα aut [Σιν]νέα GGA : [Μιμ]νέα FD || Νικομά[χου] FD (‘ΝΙΚΟΛΛ ou ΝΙΚΟΜΑ’), CID : Νικολ[άου] SIG 3 Εὐφά[ντου] aut Εὐφά[νεος] GGA || Χίων GGA : Χίου SIG : ἐχ Χίου *Flacelière* 4 Αὐτο[λύκου] GGA || [... Βοιωτῶν ...] GGA 5 [τος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς] *Bourguet ad FD III 1.275 : [τος Τρῶς Ἀλεξανδρεὺς] GGA, collatis SIG 585,40 (a. 166/5) (Κάσσανδρος Μενεσθέος) Τρῶς ἀπὸ Ἀλεξανδρείας; 585,44 (a. 194/3) (Ἥγησιάναξ Διογένης) Ἀλεξανδρεὺς ἐκ τῆς Τρωιάδος et FD III 1.275,1 Αἰολεὺς ἀπὸ Ἀλεξανδ[ρείας], sed v. M. Riçl, IK 53 (1997) 250* 6 [διατελεῖ]i GGA : [διετειλε]i (sic) *BCH* 9 θεο[ῦ καὶ ὑπάρχειν τὴν] GGA (‘Honoribus Lyconi antea in contione Amphictyonom datis hieromnemes addunt coronam, confirmant immunitatem etc., titulum incidendum curant’ *SIG*) 10 αὐ[τῶι προδικίαν καὶ] GGA 12 [πᾶντεσσι τοῖς ἀγῶνεσσι] *BCH* : πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγῶνοισι] GGA 13 ἀναγ[ράψαι δὲ καὶ τὸ δόλγ]μα *BCH, GGA*

a crown of laurel from the god;⁵ that [he will have? the priority
of trial] (*prodikia*) awarded to him by the Amphictyony⁶ [and
inviola]bility (*asylia*)⁷ observed by all both in war and in peace 10
[and personal safety (*asphaleia*)] and exemption from taxation
(*ateleia*) and precedence in seating (*proedria*) in all [contests
whi]ch the Amphictyony organizes;⁸ and that the *hieromnemes*
shall also in[scribe this decre]e in [the sanctuary of
Apol]lo.

15

¹ On this inscription see *CID* IV 63 with the commentary by F. Lefèvre.

² The line containing the name of the Delphian archon has been lost. For dating the inscription on other grounds see note 3, and for the problems involved in dating Delphic inscriptions of the IIIrd century see F. Lefèvre, 'La chronologie du III^e siècle à Delphes, d'après les Actes amphictioniques (280–200)', *BCH* 119 (1995) 161–208, especially 161–9.

³ *Hieromnemon* is the technical term for a representative sent by each of the Amphictyonic states to the Delphic council. On lines 2–5 there is room for 9 Aetolian, 1 Chian, 2 Delphian and 2 Boeotian representatives; no Phocian representative is listed. According to F. Lefèvre, *BCH* 119 (1995) 194, the number of Aetolian representatives (raised in 238 from 9 to 11), the presence of Boeotian and the absence of Phocian representatives together suggest a date in 240/39 or, preferably, 239/8 (autumn of 239); cp. F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie Pyléo-Delphique: Histoire et Institutions*, 1998, 33 n. 134; N.G.L. Hammond and F.W. Walbank, *A History of Macedonia*, III, 1988, 329 n. 1; P. Sánchez, *L'Amphictionie des Pyles et de Delphes. Recherches sur son rôle historique, des origines au II^e siècle de notre ère*, 2001, 288–91, 295–7, 525. *CID* dates the inscription between 244/3 and 239/8.

⁴ Note that 'from Alexandria' is supplemented purely on the basis of the occurrence of the collocation 'from the Troad from Alexandria' or 'from Aeolis from Alexandria' in the case of three other persons on inscriptions from Delphi. Older editions read '[from the Troad from Alexandria] from Aeolis', but M. Riçl, *IK* 53 (1997) 250, has pointed out that this collocation 'is attested neither in literary sources nor in inscriptions'.

⁵ R. Flacelière, *Les Aitolians à Delphes*, 1937, 260 has suggested that Lyc0 was honored for a public lecture given by him during the Pythian festival; cp. F. Lefèvre on *CID* IV 63. For a survey of 'men of letters' who have been honored in Delphi, see H. Bouvier, 'Hommes de lettres dans les inscriptions Delphiques', *ZPE* 58 (1985) 119–35 (Lyc0 122 and 133 no. 69); cp. F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie* 225; Chr. Marek, *Die Proxenie*, 1984, 212.

⁶ On the functions of the Amphictyony and the *hieromnemes*, see F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie* 183–91 and 205–16, and on their relationship in this particular instance see F. Lefèvre on *CID* IV 63 and *L'Amphictionie* 189 n. 133 and 209 n. 216.

⁷ The *asylia* refers to a person's belongings; the *asphaleia*, which follows, to his person; cp. P. Sánchez, *L'Amphictionie* 320.

7 Themistius, *Orationes* 21 255b–c (BT 2.35.22–36.10 Downey-Norman)

- b διὰ τοῦτο ἡσπάζετο Ἀρίστων Κλεάνθην καὶ τῶν
 ὁμιλητῶν ἐκοινώνει, διὰ τοῦτο Κράντορα Κράτης, διὰ
 τοῦτο Σπεύσιππος ἐκ Χαλκηδόνος μετεπέμπετο Ξενο-
 9 w κράτην. Λύκων δὲ καὶ Ἀρίστων ὁ ἐκ Λυκείου ἄμφω
 μὲν περὶ τοὺς Ἀριστοτέλους λόγους εἰχέτην, ἐν δόξῃ 5
 δὲ ὧν ὁ Λύκων ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ τοσαύτῃ ὥστε καὶ τοὺς πο-
 λεμίους διὰ τὸ κλέος ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ καθάπερ ἱερῶν
 ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν Λύκωνος πλοίων, ὅμως οὐκ ἐδυσχέ-
 ραινε πρὸς τὸν Ἀρίστωνα τοῦτον οὐδὲ ἐκνίζετο ἐκ
 c προσεδρίας μᾶλλον ἐπιδιδόντα, ἀλλὰ συνωμολόγει 10
 μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ χαρίτων ὅτι ὁ χωλὸς τὸν ἀρτίποδα
 παρατρέχει. συνέβη γὰρ τῷ Ἀρίστωνι καὶ πεπηρῶσθαι
 τὸ σκέλος.

1–4 *Speus. F 20 Isnardi Parente = Speus. T 11 Tarán = Crantor T 4f Mette* 1–2 *Aristo Stoic. F 334 SVF 1.76* 2 Κράντορα Κράτης] cf. *D.L. 4.22* 3 Σπεύσιππος—Ξενοκράτην] cf. *D.L. 4.3* 4–13 *Aristo F 4 Wehrli; IK 53 (1997) T 169.12 p. 257* 5–6 ἐν δόξῃ δὲ ὧν ... τοσαύτῃ] cf. 1.26–7 et 34–7 6 ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ] v. ad 1.129

[*AHΦΞΟ (= C, N, a, b, k, n, p, r, w, x)*] 1 (μόνῳ) τῶν *Reiske* 2 ὁμιλη-
 τῶν] μελετῶν *Reiske* || κράτορα *AHΞΦχ* 3 πεύσιππος *AHΞ* 4
 Λύκων *Φ'aw marg.*: κύμων *AHΞ*: κύκων *Φ'px* 5 περὶ] πρὸς *Wehrli*
 9 ἐκνίζετο (ὀρῶν) *Petavius* 10 προσεδρείας *Petavius*: προσεδρεία
ax: προεδρείας *ΞΦΟrell., vulg.* || ἐπιδιδόντος *dubitanter Capelle, RE*
13 (1927) 2308, Wehrli 11 παιδείας (*vel* -είας) *H'ΞΦ* 12 καὶ
 πεπηρῶσθαι] καταπεπηρῶσθαι *Deichgräber ap. S. Oppermann,*
Θεμίστιος, I. Εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ πατέρα, II. Βασανιστὴς ἢ φιλόσοφος (20.
und 21. Rede), Diss. Göttingen 1962, p. 38

8 Antigonus Carystius ap. Athenaeum, *Deipnosophistae*, 12.69 547D–548B (BT 3.207.8–208.21 Kaibel)

- 7 w D καὶ Λύκων δὲ ὁ Περιπατητικός, ὡς φησιν Ἀντίγο-
 νος ὁ Καρύστιος, κατ' ἀρχὰς ἐπιδημήσας παιδείας
 ἔνεκα ταῖς Ἀθήναις περὶ συμβολικοῦ κώθωνος καὶ

⁸ On the privileges of *prodikia*, *asylia*, *asphaleia*, *ateleia*, *proedria* see P. Sánchez, *L'Amphictionie* 317–21; F. Lefèvre, *L'Amphictionie* 233–40.

7 Themistius, *Orations* 21 255b–c (*BT* 2.35.22–36.10 Downey-Norman)

b For that reason Aristo had a great affection for Cleanthes and shared pupils with him;¹ for that reason Crates (felt the same) for Crantor; for that reason Speusippus sent for Xenocrates from Chalcedon. As for Lyco and Aristo—the one from the Lyceum—while both were engaged in studying the theories of Aristotle, Lyco had so great a reputation for education that even enemies at sea, because of his fame, kept away from Lyco's ships as if they were sacred. Nevertheless he did not have bad feelings towards this Aristo and was not grieved <to see him> make better progress
c through diligence. Rather, he admitted with playful charm that the lame outruns the sound of foot. For in fact Aristo had the bad luck to have a crippled leg.

¹ In this oration Themistius is trying to define what characterizes the true philosopher. One of the characteristics of the philosopher is, according to Themistius, that he is willing to share his knowledge, especially with those who desire to be taught, and will not compete with his colleagues as a bronze-smith or a poet might do, 'for once the true has become visible and has shone forth in philosophy, all who have been engaged in this activity together benefit from it with no blood shed' (21 255a). First he mentions an example taken from the Stoa, then two taken from the Academy, and finally Lyco and Aristo as representatives of the Peripatos.

8 Antigonus of Carystus in Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner*, 12.69 547D–548B (*BT* 3.207.8 –208.21 Kaibel)

D And (to give another example)¹ according to Antigonus of Carystus, Lyco, the Peripatetic, who originally came to live in Athens to complete his education, knew all the ins and outs of a

πόσον ἐκάστη τῶν ἐταιρουσῶν ἐπράττετο μίσθωμα
 ἀκριβῶς ἠπίστατο. ὕστερον δὲ καὶ τοῦ περιπάτου προ- 5
 στὰς ἐδείπνιζε τοὺς φίλους ἀλαζονεῖα καὶ πολυτελεία
 πολλῇ χρώμενος. χωρὶς γὰρ τῶν παραλαμβανομένων
 εἰς αὐτὰ ἀκροαμάτων καὶ ἀργυρωμάτων καὶ στρωμνῆς
 ἢ λοιπῇ παρασκευῇ καὶ ἢ τῶν δείπνων περιεργία καὶ ὁ
 E τῶν τραπεζοποιῶν καὶ μαγείρων ὄχλος τοσοῦτος ἦν 10
 ὥστε πολλοὺς ὀρρωδεῖν καὶ βουλομένους προσιέναι
 πρὸς τὴν διατριβὴν ἀνακόπτεσθαι, [καὶ] καθάπερ εἰς
 πολίτευμα πονηρὸν καὶ χορηγιῶν καὶ λειτουργιῶν
 πληρὲς εὐλαβουμένους προσάγειν. ἔδει γὰρ ἄρξαι τε
 τὴν νομιζομένην ἐν τῷ Περιπάτῳ ἀρχὴν (αὕτη δ' ἦν 15
 ἐπὶ τῆς εὐκοσμίας τῶν ἐπιχειρούντων) τριάκονθ' ἡμέ-
 ρας, εἶτα τῇ ἔνῃ καὶ νέᾳ λαβόντα ἀφ' ἐκάστου τῶν
 ἐπιχειρούντων ἑννέα ὀβολοὺς ὑποδέξασθαι μὴ μόνον
 αὐτοὺς τοὺς τὴν συμβολὴν εἰσενεγκόντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ 20
 οὓς παρακαλέσειεν ὁ Λύκων, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐπιμελῶς
 F συναντῶντας τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τὴν σχολήν, ὥστε
 γίνεσθαι μηδὲ εἰς τὸν μυρισμὸν καὶ τοὺς στεφάνους
 ἱκανὸν τὸ ἐκλεγόμενον ἀργύριον· ἱεροποιῆσαί τε καὶ
 τῶν Μουσειῶν ἐπιμελητὴν γενέσθαι. ἃ δὲ πάντα ἐφαί- 25
 νετο λόγου μὲν ἀλλότρια καὶ φιλοσοφίας εἶναι, τρυ-
 φῆς δὲ καὶ περιστάσεως οἰκειότερα. καὶ γὰρ εἰ παρ-
 ἱεντό τινες τῶν μὴ δυναμένων εἰς ταῦτα ἀναλίσκειν
 ἀπὸ βραχείας καὶ τῆς τυχούσης ὀρμώμενοι χορηγίας, ὃ
 γ' ἔθισμός ἐστιν ἡν ἄτοπος. οὐ γὰρ ἵνα συρρυνέντες
 ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῆς ἕως τοῦρθρίου γενομένης τραπέζης 30
 ἀπολαύσωσιν ἢ χάριν ἐξοινίας ἐποιήσαντο τὰς συν-
 548 ὁδοὺς ταύτας οἱ περὶ Πλάτωνα καὶ Σπεύσιππον, ἀλλ'
 ἵνα φαίνωνται καὶ τὸ θεῖον τιμῶντες καὶ μουσικῶς
 ἀλλήλοις συμπεριφερόμενοι, καὶ τὸ πλεῖστον ἕνεκεν 35
 ἀνέσεως καὶ φιλολογίας. ἃ δὲ πάντα γέγονεν δεύτερα
 παρὰ τοῖς ὕστερον τῶν τε χλανίδων καὶ τῆς πολυ-
 τελείας τῆς εἰρημένης· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε τοὺς λοιποὺς
 ὑπεξαίρουμαι. ὁ δὲ Λύκων ὑπ' ἀλαζονείας καὶ ἐν τῷ

drinkingbout paid for by subscription and also how big a fee each of the women who went with men (as *hetaira*) earned. And later too, when he became head of the Peripatos, he used to entertain his friends at dinner, making an ostentatious display and running into great expense. For apart from the entertainers that were called in on these occasions and the silver-ware and couch-coverings, the rest of the arrangements, the over-elaborateness of the meals, and the crowd of servers and caterers were such that many persons were intimidated and, even though they wanted to join the school, were stopped from doing so, [just] as if they were wary of coming into contact with a body of citizens of dubious moral character and burdened with obligations to finance festivities and other public services. For one was obliged to serve for thirty days in the office which had been instituted on a regular basis in the Peripatos—this (office) was (created) to supervise the good behavior of those who were following courses in the school—and then having obtained on the last day of the month nine obols from each of the students, to entertain at dinner not only those who had paid the fee themselves, but also those whom Lyco would invite, and, moreover, those among the older men as well who took the trouble to meet together at the school, with the result that the money collected would prove to be not even sufficient (to pay) for the perfumery and the wreaths; besides (one was obliged) to offer a sacrifice and to act as overseer of the rites in honor of the Muses.² Now, all this was obviously foreign to dialectic and philosophy, and more at home with luxuriousness and outward pomp. For even though some were admitted who were unable to spend money on these things because the resources at their disposal were too meager and negligible, the practice in itself was quite misplaced. For it was not for the purpose of flocking together to the same place and enjoying the pleasures of the table until dawn, or for the sake of getting drunk, that Plato, Speusippus and their followers held these meetings, but rather in order that they could be seen to honor the gods and consort with one another in a cultivated manner,³ and, for the most part, for the sake of relaxation and learned discussion. But in the eyes of those who came later all this evidently has become secondary to their woollen cloaks and their expensive way of living as described above; for I, for my part, do not make an exception for the others.⁴ But Lyco through his love of ostenta-

ἐπιφανεστάτῳ τῆς πόλεως τόπῳ ἐν τῇ Κόνωνος οἰκίᾳ
 B εἶχεν εἰκοσίκλινον οἶκον, ὅς ἦν ἐπιτήδειος αὐτῷ πρὸς 40
 τὰς ὑποδοχάς. ἦν δὲ ὁ Λύκων καὶ σφαιριστὴς ἀγαθὸς
 καὶ ἐπιδέξιος.

1–42 Wilamowitz, *Antigonos*, 84–5; *Antigon. F 23 Dorandi = Speus. T 35 Tarán* (deest ap. Isnardi Parente); *IK 53* (1997) T 169.10 p. 255–6
 1–7 Λύκων — χρώμενος] *Ath. Epit.* (2.2.96.16–25 Peppink), omissis 7–
 10 χωρὶς — ἦν, 12–29 [καὶ] — ἄτοπος, 35–8 ἃ δὴ — ὑπεξαίρουμαι
 5–6 τοῦ περιπάτου προστάς] v. ad 1.2 31–4 *Eust. Od. I.110* (1.30.1–
 3 Stallbaum) 36 τῶν χλανίδων] cf. 1.28–9 41–2 ἦν — ἐπιδέξιος]
 cf. 1.34

[AEC (EC = *Ath. Epit.*)] 1–2 ὡς φησιν — Καρύστιος om. EC
 6 καὶ πολυτελείᾳ om. EC 8 ἀκροαμάτων A: χρυσωμάτων U.
Köhler, RhM 39 (1884) 294: <καὶ χρυσωμάτων> καὶ ἀργυρωμάτων S.P.
Peppink, Observationes in Athenæi Deipnosophistas, Leiden 1936, p. 74
 10 τραπεζοποιῶν Meineke: τραπεζῶν A 11–12 ὥστε — ἀνακόπ-
 τεσθαι] πολλοὶ γοῦν βουλόμενοι προσιέναι πρὸς τὴν διατριβὴν
 ἀνεκόπτοντο EC 12 καὶ del. *Schweighaeuser post Casaubonum*
 13 χορηγιῶν Musurus: χορηγίαν A 24 Μουσείων U. *Köhler RhM*
 39 (1884) 295–6 (cf. Wilamowitz, *Antigonos*, 264 adn. 2): μουσῶν A
 28–9 ὅ γ' ἐθισμὸς Wilamowitz: ὅ γε μισθὸς A 29–32 οὐ γὰρ ἵνα —
 Σπεύσιππον] καίτοι οἱ περὶ Πλάτωνα, φησίν, φασί, καὶ Σπεύσιππον
 οὐ χάριν ἐξοινίας τὰς συνόδους ταύτας ἐποιήσαντο EC 30
 τοῦρθρίου Meineke (τοῦ ὀρθρίου Musurus): τοῦ θρίου A: ὀρθρου
Kaibel: τοῦ ὀρθρου Wehrli 33 μουσικῶς Th. Bergk, *Fünf*
Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie und
Astronomie, Leipzig 1883, p. 67 adn. 1: φυσικῶς AEC (cf. *Dorandi ad*
Antigon. F 23, p. 50 adn. 118): φιλικῶς *Eust.* 36 παρὰ τοῖς
Schweighaeuser: παρ' αὐτοῖς A 38–42 ὁ δὲ Λύκων — ἐπιδέξιος]
 ὁ δὲ Λύκων καὶ σφαιριστὴς ἀγαθὸς ἦν καὶ εἰκοσίκλινον εἶχεν οἶκον
 ἐπιτήδειον πρὸς τὰς ὑποδοχάς EC

II. SCRIPTA

Ethica

- 9 Cicero, *Tusculanae Disputationes* 3.32.77–8 (BT 13.356.18–
 357.10 Pohlenz)

77 nam Cleanthes quidem sapientem consolatur, qui
 consolatione non eget. nihil enim esse malum, quod tur-

tious display even had, in the most conspicuous part of the city, a
 B twenty-couch room in Conon's house, which suited him for holding his receptions. Lyco, moreover, was a good and dexterous ball-player.

¹ In book 12 Athenaeus drops the fiction of the banquet and discourses in his own name on those persons who made themselves notorious for their luxurious way of living and on their way of enjoying life. The example of Lyco is followed by one involving Anaxarchus of Abdera. On this passage cp. Antigon. F 23 Dorandi with the notes on p. 49–51; C. Natali, *Bios Theoretikos. La vita di Aristotele e l'organizzazione della sua scuola*, Bologna 1991, p. 113–15; and A. Dalby in this volume.

² On '(the rites in honor of) the Muses', see Wilamowitz, *Antigonos*, p. 264–5 and Dorandi on Antigon. F 23, p. 50 n. 116.

³ This is a rendering of the conjecture μουσικῶς. The reading of the MSS. φυσικῶς is interpreted by Wilamowitz, *Antigonos*, p. 80 in the sense of 'in a natural, relaxed manner'.

⁴ Athenaeus is speaking for himself here.

II. WRITINGS

Ethics

9 Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 3.32.77–8 (BT 13.356.18–357.10 Pohlenz)¹

77 Now as for Cleanthes, he is consoling the wise man who does not need consolation. For if you succeed in convincing someone

pe non sit, si lugenti persuaseris, non tu illi luctum, sed
 stultitiam detraxeris; alienum autem tempus docendi. et
 tamen non satis mihi uidetur uidisse hoc Cleanthes, sus- 5
 19 W suscipi aliquando aegritudinem posse ex eo ipso, quod esse
 summum malum Cleanthes ipse fateatur. quid enim dice-
 mus, cum Socrates Alcibiadi persuasisset, ut accepimus,
 eum nihil hominis esse nec quicquam inter Alcibiadem
 summo loco natum et quemuis baiolum interesse, cum 10
 se Alcibiades adflicaret lacrimansque Socrati supplex
 esset, ut sibi uirtutem traderet turpitudinemque depelle-
 ret,—quid dicemus, Cleanthe? tum in illa re, quae aegritu-
 78 dine Alcibiadem adficiebat, mali nihil fuisse? quid? illa
 Lyconis qualia sunt? qui aegritudinem extenuans parvis 15
 ait eam rebus moueri, fortunae et corporis incommodis,
 non animi malis. quid ergo? illud, quod Alcibiades dole-
 bat, non ex animi malis uitiiisque constabat?

1–7 *Cleanth. Stoic. F 577 SVF I.130* 4–14 *Socrates F I C 29 SSR I.54 Giannantoni* 7–10 *Aeschin. Socr. F VI A 47 SSR 2.606 Giannantoni* 8–13 *cf. Aug. Civ. Dei 14.8 (= Aeschin. Socr. F VI A 47 SSR 2.606 Giannantoni)* 10–18 *Aeschin. Socr. F 10 Dittmar = Aeschin. Socr. F VI A 52 SSR 2.609 Giannantoni* 14–17 *IK 53 (1997) T 169.4 p. 251* 15–17 *cf. 1.7–10; 7.10–12* 16 *fortunae] cf. 17*

[X = GKR^V] 2 enim *om. G^I* 5–7 suscipi—Cleanthes *om. K* 7 Cleanthes *del. J. Bake, Scholica Hypomnemata 4, 1852, 96, sed cf. J. Vahlen, Opuscula Academica 2, 1908, 130 adn. 13 et 409* 12 *illam ante depelleret add. V²* 13 *acleanthe V: o cleanthe E. Ströbel, Philologus 49 (1890) 58 || tum (cf. 6 aliquando): num edd.* 13–14 *aegritudinem X: corr. K^IR^cV^I* 15 *quia GRV^I* 17 *mali X: corr. V²*

10 Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* 2.21.129.9 (GCS 2.183.19–184.1 Stählin-Früchtel)

20 W 9 ναὶ μὴν Λύκων ὁ Περιπατητικὸς τὴν ἀληθινὴν χα-
 ρὰν τῆς ψυχῆς τέλος ἔλεγεν εἶναι, ὥς †Λεύκιμος† τὴν

in mourning that nothing is evil which is not base, you will remove not his sorrow, but his folly; but this is hardly the appropriate time for teaching him this.² And yet it seems to me Cleanthes did not quite see this, that grief can sometimes be incurred as a result of the very thing that he himself admits to be the worst evil. For what shall we say, when we see that Socrates, as we are told, convinced Alcibiades that he was nothing of a man and that there was no difference at all, for all his high birth, between Alcibiades and any porter, whereupon Alcibiades was grieved and implored Socrates with tears to teach him virtue and remove baseness,— what shall we say, Cleanthes? That in that case there was no (part of) evil in
78 this thing which affected Alcibiades with grief? And what about Lyco? What do these words of his amount to, when he, by way of minimizing grief, says that it is occasioned by small things, discomforts of fortune and of the body, not by evils of the soul? I ask you then, did the grief that Alcibiades felt, not come from evils and flaws of the soul?

¹ On this passage, see Stephen A. White, 'Cicero and the Therapists', in: J.G.F. Powell (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher*, 1995, 219–46, especially 233–9.

² At the end of 75 Cicero summarizes the 'tasks of consolers' (*officia consolantium*) and then, in 76, gives a survey of the views held by various philosophers on the subject. He mentions the Stoic Cleanthes ('Some think the sole duty in consolation is to teach that the situation is not bad at all, as Cleanthes does'), the Peripatetics ('Some think we should teach that it is not very bad, as the Peripatetics'), Epicurus and Chrysippus. Personally, Cicero prefers a combination of the various views, and he particularly stresses the need to apply the right type of consolation to the right person at the right moment. Section 77 then opens with a summary statement of three methods of consoling, which correspond to these views: 1. by pointing out that there is either no evil or very little; 2. by discussing the human condition in general terms and as applied to the specific person involved; 3. by showing that it is foolish to let oneself be overcome by sorrow, because it is useless. After that comes our text in which Cleanthes and Lyco and criticized.

10 Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 2.21.129.9 (GCS 2.183.19–184.1 Stählin-Früchtel)¹

9 And indeed,² Lyco the Peripatetic said that the goal (of life) (*telos*) is true joy of the soul, as †Leucimus†,³ that (it is) the (joy)

ἐπὶ τοῖς καλοῖς.

1–3 *Leucippus* 67 A 37 DK II 79.31–3; cf., e.g., *Arist. EN* 10.9 1179 b 29–31 τὸ ἥθος ... στέργον τὸ καλὸν καὶ δυσχεραῖνον τὸ αἰσχρόν 1–2 *IK* 53 (1997) T 169.11 p. 256

1 Λύκων *D. Ruhnken, P. Rutilii Lupi de Figuris Sententiarum et Elocutionis*, 1768, 100 ad 2.7; cf. *E. Zeller, Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung dargestellt II* 2³, 1879, 923 adn. 3 : λύκος codd. (de permutatione nominum Λύκος, Λύκιος & Λύκων v. *T. Hemsterhuis ad Ar. Pl.*, 1744, 206–7 2 †Λεύκιμος†] Λεύκιππος *Sylburg* : Λυκίσκος (cf. **3B**.3) vel ὡς ἀνακειμένην ἐπὶ τοῖς καλοῖς *I. Bywater, Journal of Philology* 4 (1872) 210

Rhetorica

11 Cicero, *De Finibus* 5.5.13 (BT 13.161.27–162.5 Schiche)

- 13 simus igitur contenti his. namque horum posteri meliores illi quidem mea sententia quam reliquarum philosophi disciplinarum, sed ita degenerant, ut ipsi ex se nati esse uideantur. primum Theophrasti, Strato, physicum se uoluit; in quo etsi est magnus, tamen noua pleraque et 5
17 W perpauca de moribus. huius, Lyco, oratione locuples, rebus ipsis ieunior. concinnus deinde et elegans huius, Aristo, sed ea, quae desideratur a magno philosopho, gravitas, in eo non fuit; scripta sane et multa et polita, sed nescio quo pacto auctoritatem oratio non habet. 10

1–10 *Arist. T* 76b *Düring* p. 427 1–7 *Strato F* 12 *Wehrli* 4–9 *IK* 53 (1997) T 169.3 p. 250–1 4 *Theophrasti Thphr. no.* 18.19 *FHS&G* 6 huius, Lyco] v. ad 1.2 6–7 oratione — ieunior] cf. 1.3; 14–17; 18–19; 128–9 7–10 *Aristo F* 10 *Wehrli*

[*BERNV*] 6 lyco V : lico R : lisias et N² (versu ultra marginem continuato; ex priore scriptura lic cognosci posse videtur); om. BE spatio vacuo relicto 7 ipsi rebus R

based upon what is honorable.⁴

¹ On this passage, see Stephen A. White in this volume.

² This is part of an extensive doxography concerning the *telos*. In section 129 Clement mentions the Stoics Zeno of Citium; Cleanthes; Diogenes of Babylon; Antipater of Tarsus; Archedemus of Tarsus; Panaetius of Rhodes; Posidonius; Aristo of Chius; Herillus of Carthago. After a brief mention of the younger members of the Academy, Clement then passes on to Lyc0. Immediately after the passage cited in the text, Clement cites Critolaus.

³ For Sylburg's Leucippus see 67 A 37 DK II 79; Lyciscus is mentioned in the *Vita Aristotelis Hesychii* as a leader of the Peripatos after Aristo (3B). The second of Bywater's conjectures would dispense with any name: 'the goal (of life) is ..., as being based upon what is honorable'.

⁴ Or 'beautiful' instead of 'honorable'.

Rhetoric

11 Cicero, *On Ends* 5.5.13 (*BT* 13.161.27–162.5 Schiche)

13 Let us, therefore, content ourselves with these men.¹ For those successors of theirs are indeed in my opinion better than the philosophers of the remaining schools, but have degenerated to such a degree that they might seem to have been born out of themselves. To begin with, (the successor) of Theophrastus, Strato, wished to be a natural philosopher; but great as he is in this department, yet most (of what he says) is new-fangled and (there is) very little on ethics. His (successor), Lyc0, was rich in style, but rather poor in the (subject) matter itself. Next, Lyc0's (successor), Aristo, was polished and elegant, but the quality which one desires in a great philosopher, gravity, was lacking in him; he wrote much, it is true, and well-finished at that, but his eloquence somehow does not have authority.

¹ M. Pupius Piso is discussing happiness from a Peripatetic point of view. After some preliminaries (9–11), he discusses the relative positions of Aristotle and Theophrastus (12), and decides to make these two his authorities; then he turns to their followers whom he describes as 'degenerate' (13–14). Cp. W.W. Fortenbaugh in this volume. For Theophrastus, see Thphr. nos. 385, 672, 590, 482, 498 *FHS&G*.

12 Rutilius Lupus, *De figuris* 2.7 (32.1–27 Brooks)

CHARAKTERISMOS

quem ad modum pictor coloribus figuras describit,
 sic orator hoc schemate aut uitia aut uirtutes eorum, de
 26 W quibus loquitur, deformat. Lyconis: Quid in hoc arbitrer
 bonae spei reliquum residere, qui omne uitae tempus 5
 una ac desperatissima consuetudine producit? nam simul
 atque ex prioris diei nimia cibi ac uini satietate, uix, me-
 ridiano tempore, plenus crapula est experrectus, primum
 oculis mero madidis, humore obcaecatis, uisco grauidis,
 lucem constanter intueri non potest; deinde confectis 10
 uiribus, utpote cuius uenae non sanguine sed uino sunt
 repletae, se ipse erigere non ualet; tandem duobus innix-
 us, languidus, qui cubando sit defatigatus, tunicatus, sine
 pallio, soleatus, praeligato palliolo frigus a capite defen-
 dens, flexa ceruice, summissis genibus, colore exsanguis, 15
 protinus ex cubiculari lectulo excitatus in triclinium tra-
 hitur. ibi praesto sunt quotidiani pauci eodem studio ex-
 citati conuiuiae. hic uero princeps paulum illud, reliquum
 quod habet menti ac sensu, poculis extrudere ex ea fes-
 tinat; bibendo prouocat, lacessit, <si,> sicut in hostium 20
 proelio, quam plurimos superarit atque adflixerit, amplis-
 simam sibi uictoriam partam existimans. interea procedit
 simul et †illud tempus et potio†; oculi uinum lacriman-
 tes caligant, ebriosum ipsi uix ebrii cognoscunt. alius
 sine causa iurgio proximum lacessit; alius somno dedi- 25
 tus ui cogitur uigilare, alius rixari parat; alium turbas
 uitantem ac domum reuerti cupientem retinet ianitor,
 pulsat, exire prohibet, domini interdictum demonstrans.
 interea alium contumeliose extra ianuam eiectum uacil-
 lantem puer sustentat ac ducit pallium per lutum trahen- 30
 tem. nouissime solus in triclinio relictus, non prius pocu-

12 Rutilius Lupus, *On Figures* 2.7 (32.1–27 Brooks)CHARACTERIZATION¹

In the way that a painter uses colors to represent figures, so does the orator use this figure to delineate either the vices or virtues of those about whom he speaks. From Lyco: What remnant of good hope should I think remains in the man who conducts the whole span of his life in accordance with one and the most desperate habit? For as soon as he awakens after too great an indulgence in food and wine the day before, with difficulty, by the time of midday, filled with intoxication, at first with eyes sodden with unmixed wine, blinded by a film of moisture, and heavy with sticky stuff, he cannot look at the light without blinking. Then, drained of strength as he is, since his veins are filled not with blood but with wine, he does not by himself have the strength to get himself up. At last, leaning on two persons, listless, exhausted by sleeping as he is, in his tunic, without a cloak, wearing his slippers, keeping the cold from his head with a handkerchief wrapped round it, with bended neck, sunken knees and bloodless color, he straight from being roused from his sleeping bed is dragged to the dining room. There a few regular companions, roused with the same effort, are present. Our man, however, as leader hastens to drive out of his mind with drinking cups the little that he has left of mind and sense; by drinking he provokes them, he assails them, because he thinks that <if>, as in a battle with enemies, he has conquered and floored as many as possible, he will have won a most splendid victory. Meanwhile proceeds at the same time †that time and drinking†;² the eyes dropping tears of wine become dimmed, drunk themselves they hardly recognize a drunk; one without cause assails his neighbor with taunts; another, who has capitulated to sleep, is with main force brought to wake; another is ready to pick a quarrel; another, who seeks to avoid the commotion and desires to return home, is held back, struck, prevented from departing by the doorkeeper who makes clear his master's prohibition. Meanwhile, another, who is tottering after being thrown out the door, is supported by a slave boy and led on with his coat dragging through the mud. Finally, left alone in the din-

lum ex manibus emittit, quam somnus oppressit bibentem, ac dissolutis artubus ipsum poculum suapte natura dormienti excidit.

CHARAKTERISMOS] *cf. Auct. ad Her. 4.49.63* ('Effictio'); *Carmen de Figuris 148–50* fit depictio, cum uerbis ut imagine pingo. I 'pocula, certa tenens flexa ceruice iacebat, I limo[ni]des, grauis optutu, madido ore renidens'. (*cf. D'Angelo p. 128–9*); *cf. Quint. Inst. 9.3.99* 4 deformat] *cf. φραστικὸς ἀνὴρ 1.3 et τὸ ἐκφραστικὸν αὐτοῦ 1.6* || *Lyconis*] *de Lycone philosopho Peripatetico v. Ruhnken p. 99*

[ABV = Z; a = ed. Veneta Aldina 1523, b = ed. Basileensis 1521] 3 uitia *Casaubon* : uitas Z 4 *Lyconis* a : *Lyconi BVb* : *Lycchi A* 6 despiciatissima *Halm* 7 prioris diei *J.F. Heusinger ap. Ruhnken* : prioribus diei Z || cibi *BV* : tibi A || uix *R. Stephanus* : uia Z 8 expectatus *AB* : exporrectus *V* 9 uisco *C. von Barth, Adversariorum Commentariorum Libri LX, 1648, LV.1 p. 2576, et Gesner* : uisu Z : uino *Casaubon* 14 praeligato palliolo *Jacob* : prae lectulo palliolo *AB* : pro lectulo pallido *V* 17 pauci] †pauci† *Brooks* : <nec> pauci *Ruhnken* : fuci *M. Haupt, Opuscula III, Leipzig 1876, 368* : poculi *J. Mähly, Philologus 15 (1860) 723* : faucium *C. Morawski, Philologus 54 (1895) 149* 19 poculis *AV* : puerilis *B* 20 <si> add. *Halm* 20–1 sicuti hostium proelio *Brooks* 21 superarit atque afflixerit *R. Stephanus* : superarat (superaret *V*) atque afflixerat (affixerat *BV*) Z 22 partam *Ruhnken* : paratam *BV* : om. A 23 †illud tempus et potio†] illudendo tempus et potando *Haase* : locus desperatus, ut videtur (*v. Brooks p. 88–9*) 24 ebriosum—cognoscunt] ebrii se ipsi vix cognoscunt *post Madvig Brooks* || alius *BV* : alia A 25 alius *BV* : aliud A 26 turbas *AV* : turbam *B* 28 domini incertus *ap. Ruhnken* : domum Z || interdictum A : interdictam *BV* 29 interea *Jacob* : inter A : item *BV* || ianuam eiectum *AB* : ianuam ἐρεχταῖ ἐiectum *V* : ianuam electum *b* 29–30 uacillantem *b* : uacillanter Z 30 puer *AB* : puerum *V*

Fragmentum Incertae Sedis

13 Herodianus, *De inflexione nominum* 3.2 (BT 2.1.716.23–30 Lentz)

28 W τὸ ἄλας τὸ οὐδετέρως λεγόμενον ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ σπανίως εὔρηται ἐν χρήσει. εὔρηται δὲ παρὰ Λύκωνι τῷ Τρωαδεὶ οἶον “τὸ ἄλας εὐῶδες ἢ δυσῶδες ὀρύσσεται”. καὶ πάλιν “ἄλατος μέδιμνον”. καὶ λέγουσί τινες ὅτι ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ οὐδετέρου γέγονε τὸ ἄλς τὸ ἄρσε- 5

ing room, he does not let his cup leave his hand before sleep has overwhelmed him while drinking, and, the strength in his limbs being dissolved, the cup of its own nature falls out of his hand while he is sleeping.

¹ On this text see W.W. Fortenbaugh in this volume. Brink 1940, 933 suggests that it was written for a treatise *On Drunkenness* (Περὶ μέθης); cp. Wehrli on F 26 p. 26.

² The sense appears to be ‘Meanwhile time and drinks flow at the same rate’, but the text may be corrupt. With Haase’s conjecture, the text would read: ‘Meanwhile time proceeds at the same time both in fooling around and in drinking’. For other conjectures see the edition of Brooks p. 88–9.

Fragment of Uncertain Provenance

13 Herodian, *On the Inflection of Nouns* 3.2 (BT 2.1.716.23–30 Lentz)

The (word) *halas* (‘salt’) as a neuter is found to be of infrequent use in ordinary language. It is found in Lyco from the Troad,¹ as for instance: “salt (*halas*) is dug up sweet-smelling or ill-smelling”. And again: “a medimnus of salt (*halatos*)”.² And some say that from this neuter the masculine *hals* (‘salt’) has been derived

νικὸν κατὰ συγκοπὴν τοῦ ᾧ ὥσπερ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ κάρη-
νον οὐδετέρου γέγονε κατὰ ἀποκοπὴν τῆς νῶν συλλα-
βῆς τὸ κάρη θηλυκόν. οὗτοι δὲ οὐ καλῶς λέγουσιν.
ἄτοπον γὰρ τὸ πλατέως εὕρισκόμενον ἐν χρήσει λέγειν
γεγενῆσθαι ἐκ τοῦ σπανίως εὕρισκομένου ἐν χρήσει. 10

1–10 = *Choerob. in Theod.* 268,25–34 *Gaisford* (GG 4.1.259.9–16
Hilgard) 1–4 τὸ ἄλας—μέδιμνον *AB* 3.1314.8–13 3 τῷ Τρωαδεῖ]
v. *ad* 1.2

[*NCV*] 2–3 Λύκωνι τῷ Τρωαδεῖ *Gaisford* : λυκάωνι τῷ τρωάδῃ *NC* :
λυκάωνι τῷ τρωάδῃ *V* 4 ἄλατος *NC* : ἀλάτων *V* 6 συγκοπὴν *NC* :
ἐκθλιψιν *V*

III. DUBIA

14 *Suda* s.v. Ἐπίχαρμος (no. 2766, LG 1.2.393.21–9 Adler)

29 W Ἐπίχαρμος, Τιτύρου ἢ Χιμάρου καὶ Σηκίδος, Συ-
ρακούσιος ἢ ἐκ πόλεως Κραστοῦ τῶν Σικανῶν· ὃς εὔρε
τὴν κωμωδίαν ἐν Συρακούσαις ἅμα Φόρμῳ. ἐδίδαξε δὲ
δράματα νβ', ὡς δὲ Λύκων φησὶ λε'. τινὲς δὲ αὐτὸν
Κῶν ἀνέγραψαν, τῶν μετὰ Κάδμου εἰς Σικελίαν μετ- 5
οικησάντων, ἄλλοι Σάμιον, ἄλλοι Μεγάρων τῶν ἐν
Σικελίᾳ. ἦν δὲ πρὸ τῶν Περσικῶν ἔτη ἕξ, διδάσκων ἐν
Συρακούσαις· ἐν δὲ Ἀθήναις Εὐέτης καὶ Εὐξενίδης
καὶ Μύλος ἐπεδείκνυντο. οὗτος εὐρετὴς καὶ τῶν μακρ-
ῶν στοιχείων η καὶ ω. καὶ Ἐπιχάρμειος λόγος, τοῦ Ἐπι- 10
χάρμου.

1–11 *Epich. T 1 PCG* 1.8 2 Κραστοῦ] cf. *St. Byz. s.v.* Κραστός p. 382
Meineke 3 Φόρμῳ] v. *Phormis T 1 PCG* 1,174 et *Epich. T 5 PCG* 1,9
4 Λύκων] *Lyconem lasensem agnoscit Th. Bergk, Commentationum de*
reliquiis comoediae Atticae antiquae, 1838, 149, Peripateticum A.O.F.
Lorenz, Leben und Schriften des Koers Epicharmos, 1864, 147 8
Εὐέτης καὶ Εὐξενίδης] *de Euate et Euxenide* v. *PCG* 5.276 et 5.544
9 Μύλος] *de Mul(I)ο* v. *PCG* 7.28 10 Ἐπιχάρμειος λόγος] = *Ambr.*
1423

[*A(GITFVM)*] 1 Χειμάρου *A* : -άρου *rell.* : corr. *Bernhardy* || Σι- →

through shortcutting (*syncope*) of the *a*, as also from the neuter *karênon* ('head') the feminine *karê* ('head') has been derived through cutting off (*apocope*) of the syllable *non*. Those who say so, are wrong. For it does not make sense to say that what is found to be widely used has been derived from what is found to be of infrequent use.²

¹ In a note on p. 721 on the entry 'Tragasai' in Stephanus of Byzantium Meineke points out that there was a famous natural salt-pit in a place of that name in the Troad (Strabo 13.1.48), Lyco's native country.

² According to Wehrli on F 28 p. 26 the fact that, as appears from this quotation by Herodian, the word 'salt' was used more than once by Lyco, suggests that 'salt' is to be taken quite literally as a mineral substance and that the quotation, therefore, is taken from a work on natural science. But see R.W. Sharples and O. Hellmann in Aristo of Ceos (*RUSCH* 13).

III. DUBIOUS

14 *Suda* under 'Epicharmus' (no. 2766, *LG* 1.2.393.21–9 Adler)

Epicharmus, (son) of Tityrus or Chimarus and Sicis, a Syracusan or from the town of Crastus of the Sicanians. (The man) who invented comedy in Syracuse at the same time as Phormus. He produced 52 plays, (or) 35 according to Lyco.¹ Some have registered him as (being) from Cos, (being one) of those who together with Cadmus moved to Sicily, others as (being) from Samos, others as (being) from Megara in Sicily. He was alive six years before the Persian wars, producing (plays) in Syracuse. At Athens, Euetes and Euxenides and Mylus displayed their powers (as comic poets). He (is) also the inventor of the long letters *eta* and *omega*. Also Epicharmean speech, (i.e.) of Epicharmus.

¹ Bergk (see *apparatus criticus*), and Wilamowitz (*Euripides Herakles*, Berlin 2 1895, I p. 150 n. 51) take this to be "der Pythagoreer Lykon", i.e. Lyco of Iasus, but this is quite uncertain; see F. Susemihl, *GGL* II p. 692 and Wehrli on F 29 p. 26. For Lycophro, proposed by Kaibel, cf. Lycophron 100 T 6 *TrGF* 1.274 Snell.

κίδος *codd.* : *corr. Bernhardt* 4 Λύκων] Λυκόφρων *dubitanter Kaibel* *Epich.*
 2 T 1 CGF 1.1,88 6 Μεγαρέα *Kaibel* 7 δὲ] τῶν *add. A* 9 Μύλος *A* :
 Μύλλος *Meineke* 9–10 οὗτος — ω *ex margine IVM*

15 Apuleius, *Apologia* 36 (BT 2.1.41.16–42.8 Helm)

ceterum quam ob rem plurimos iam piscis cognou-
rim, quorundam adhuc nescius esse nolim, discat Aemi-
lianus, quoniam usque adeo rebus meis curat; quanquam
est iam praecipiti aëuo et occidua senectute, tamen, si ui-
30 W detur, accipiat doctrinam seram plane et postumam; le- 5
gat ueterum philosophorum monumenta, tandem ut intel-
legat non me primum haec requisisse, sed iam pridem
maiores meos, Aristotelen dico et Theophrastum et Eu-
demum et Lyconem ceterosque Platonis minores, qui
plurimos libros de genitu animalium deque uictu deque 10
particulis deque omni differentia reliquerunt. bene quod
apud te, Maxime, causa agitur, qui pro tua eruditione legisti
profecto Aristotelis περὶ ζώων γενέσεως, περὶ ζώων
ἀνατομῆς, περὶ ζώων ἱστορίας multiiuga uolumina,
praeterea problemata innumera eiusdem, tum ex eadem 15
secta ceterorum, in quibus id genus uaria tractantur. quae
tanta cura conquisita si honestum et gloriosum illis fuit
scribere, cur turpe sit nobis experiri, praesertim cum
ordinatius et cohibilius eadem Graece et Latine adnitar
conscribere et in omnibus aut omissa adquirere aut de- 20
fecta supplere?

1–21 *Arist. F* 295,1 *Gigon* 1–11 *Thphr. no. 351 FHS&G* 5–16 *cf.*
Arist. fragmenta Rose p. 215 5–11 *Eudem. F* 125 *Wehrli* 5–9 *IK*
53 (1997) *T* 169.7 p. 251

[*F* = *Laurentianus* 68.2; ϕ = *Laurentianus* 29.2; *v* = *vulgata quae*
invenitur in codicibus deterioribus et in libris impressis] 3 *curat*
<et> *W. Kroll, GGA* 163 (1901) 580 8–9 *Theophrastum et*
Eudemum v: theoprastum & teudemum F ϕ 16 *secta alia manus*
in marg. ϕ : recta F ϕ 19 *adnitar v: adnitur F: adnititur ϕ*

15 Apuleius, *Self-Defence* 36 (BT 2.1.41.16–42.8 Helm)

But as to why I have already learned of many (sorts of) fish and there are some others besides that I would like to learn of,¹ let Aemilianus learn this,² because he takes such great interest in my affairs; although he is already at the age of rapid decline and sinking old age, let him nonetheless, if he so wishes, acquire some knowledge, belated to be sure and coming at the eleventh hour; let him read the records of the old philosophers, so that he may finally understand that I am not the first person to investigate these matters, but that my ancestors (did so) long ago—I mean Aristotle and Theophrastus and Eudemus and Lyco³ and the others who came after Plato, who left countless books about the generation of animals, about their ways of life and their parts, and about all kinds of differences (between them). It's a good thing this trial is held before you, Maximus,⁴ who in view of your great learning surely have read Aristotle's *On the Generation of Animals*, *On the Parts of Animals*, *On the History of Animals*, in long series of volumes, and besides innumerable *Problemata* of the same author, not to speak of those of the other members of the school, in which various matters of this kind are dealt with. Now, if it has been a source of honor and glory for these people to put in writing the results of these researches, conducted with so much care, how could it not be fitting for us to try our hand at them, all the more so as I shall try to present the same subjects in a more well-ordered and succinct manner in Greek as well as Latin and either to add what was omitted or to supply what is lacking in all of them?

¹ In sections 29–41 Apuleius takes up the first point in the accusation brought against him: namely, that he practises magic, i.e. uses fish for magical purposes. He argues that this point is utter nonsense and in the present section he stresses his purely scientific interest in fish.

² Sicinius Aemilianus, the brother of Pudentilla's (Apuleius' wife) first husband, the person behind the accusation.

³ On the existence of zoological writings by Lyco see Capelle, *RE* 13 (1927) 2306, who suggests that it simply is a mistake for Strato, and Wehrli on F 30 p. 26. S. White, 'Eudemus the Naturalist', in: W.W. Fortenbaugh & I. Bodnar (eds.), *Eudemus* (*RUSCH* 11), 207–41, suggests that Lycus of Rhegium is being referred to; see R.W. Sharples and O. Hellmann in *Aristo of Ceos* (*RUSCH* 13).

⁴ Claudius Maximus, proconsul of Africa in ca. 160/1, the judge in the trial.

IV. DICTA

de dictis Lyconis in vita antiqua Diogenis Laertii vel aliis
textibus repertis, vide

- 1 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.65 (BT 1.354.21–355.1 Marcovich) = 1.4–6
- 2 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.65 (BT 1.355.3–5 Marcovich) = 1.7–10
- 3 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.66 (BT 1.355.12–16 Marcovich) = 1.17–20
- 4 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.66 (BT 1.355.16–19 Marcovich) = 1.21–4
- 5 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.66 (BT 1.355.19–356.1 Marcovich) = 1.24–6
- 6 Themistius, *Orationes* 21 255c (BT 2.36.8–9 Downey-Norman) = 7.10–12

Dicta quae in variis gnomologiis florilegiisque Lyconi
attribuuntur

de gnomologiis florilegiisque (sacro-)profanis, vide M. Richard, ‘Florilèges spirituels, III. Florilèges Grecs. 1. Florilèges Damascéniens; 2. Florilèges sacro-profanes’, *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, Vol. 5, Paris 1964, 475–99; D. Gutas, *Greek Wisdom Literature in Arabic Translation. A Study of the Graeco-Arabic Gnomologia*, New Haven, Conn. 1975, 1–35; J.F. Kindstrand, *Gnomica Basileensia*, Uppsala 1991, 25–33; D.M. Searby, *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition*, Uppsala 1998, 28–70; S. Ihm, *Ps.-Maximus Confessor. Erste kritische Edition einer Redaktion des sacro-profanan Florilegiums Loci communes*, Stuttgart 2001, I–XXIX; D.M. Searby, ‘A preliminary survey of the Sayings of Aristo’, in: *Aristo of Ceos (RUSCH 13)*

de dictis quae Lyconi attribuuntur, vide H.B. Gottschalk, ‘Addenda Peripatetica’, *Phronesis* 18 (1973) 91–100, 94–6 et W.W. Fortenbaugh in hoc volumine

IV. SAYINGS

For sayings of Lyco found in the biography of Diogenes Laertius or other texts, see

- 1 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.65 (BT 1.354.21–355.1 Marcovich) = 1.4–6
- 2 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.65 (BT 1.355.3–5 Marcovich) = 1.7–10
- 3 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.66 (BT 1.355.12–16 Marcovich) = 1.17–20
- 4 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.66 (BT 1.355.16–19 Marcovich) = 1.21–4
- 5 Diogenes Laertius, *The Lives of the Philosophers* 5.66 (BT 1.355.19–356.1 Marcovich) = 1.24–6
- 6 Themistius, *Orations* 21 255c (BT 2.36.8–9 Downey-Norman) = 7.10–12

Sayings attributed to Lyco in various anthologies

On the (sacro-)profane anthologies, see M. Richard, ‘Florilèges spirituels, III. Florilèges Grecs. 1. Florilèges Damascéniens; 2. Florilèges sacro-profanes’, *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, Vol. 5, Paris 1964, 475–99; D. Gutas, *Greek Wisdom Literature in Arabic Translation. A Study of the Graeco-Arabic Gnomologia*, New Haven Conn. 1975, 1–35; J.F. Kindstrand, *Gnomica Basileensia*, Uppsala 1991, 25–33; D.M. Searby, *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition*, Uppsala 1998, 28–70; S. Ihm, *Ps.-Maximus Confessor. Erste kritische Edition einer Redaktion des sacroprofanen Florilegiums Loci communes*, Stuttgart 2001, I–XXIX; D.M. Searby, ‘A preliminary survey of the Sayings of Aristo’, in: *Aristo of Ceos (RUSCH 13)* forthcoming

On the sayings attributed to Lyco, see H.B. Gottschalk, ‘Addenda Peripatetica’, *Phronesis* 18 (1973) 94–6, and W.W. Fortenbaugh in the present volume

16 *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 164 (67.18 Sternbach)

- 21 W Λύκωνος.—Λύκων ὁ φιλόσοφος τὴν παιδείαν ἔλε-
γεν ἱερὸν ἄσυλον εἶναι.

post 161–3 Βίων ὁ Περιπατητικός; *idem apophthegma Lyconi attribuitur in Laur.* α14,192, f. 154^v = *Exc. Flor.* 2.13.140 (BT 4.226.10–11 Meineke), *Gnom. Basil.* 150 (66.22 Kindstrand); *Glyconi attribuitur in Corp. Par. (d)* f. 148^v.2–3 (= *Apophth. Par.* 26, p. 482 Schenkl), *Max.* 17.45/54 (418.24 Ihm; PG 91.825.1–2 Combefis), *Ross.* 21.30 f. 52^v, *Ars.* 171.15 Walz (*post* 19); *de nomine* Γλύκων cf. 1.15–16; 19; 20; 21; *app.* 2.7 1–2 Glyco F 4 Orelli 2,202 1 παιδείαν] cf. 1.3–4; 128–9; 7.6; 8.2–3; cf. *apophthegma quod Aristoteli attribuitur in D.L.* 5.19, *Stob.* 2.31.35 = *Gnom. Vat.* 50 (= *Arist. Apophth.* 24 Searby p. 102)

[*Max.*: *MaxU* = PGL, *om.* I; *MaxII* = CVAFH; *MaxI* = RSO] 1
Λύκωνος *cod.*: Γλύκωνος Sternbach propter alphabeticam auctorum
seriem, *MaxU* PL, *MaxII* CVAF, *MaxI*, *Ross.*: *om.* *Corp. Par.*, *MaxU* G,
MaxII H, *Gnom. Basil.*, *Exc. Flor.* || Λύκων (Γλύκων Sternbach) ὁ
φιλόσοφος] ὁ Λύκων *Exc. Flor.*: Λύκων ὁ σοφὸς *Gnom. Basil.* (Γλύκων
Kindstrand): Γλύκων ὁ σοφὸς *Corp. Par.*, *Max.*, *Ross.*: ὁ αὐτὸς =
Γλύκων ὁ σοφὸς *Ars.* || παιδείαν] σοφίαν *MaxU* P 2 εἶναι *ante*
ἱερὸν *MaxU* P, *Exc. Flor.*: *om.* *Ars.*

***17** *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 165 (68.10–1 Sternbach)

ὁ αὐτὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς τί λυπεῖ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς εἶπε·
“πονηρὸς εὐτυχῶν”.

ὁ αὐτὸς = Λύκων ὁ φιλόσοφος *Gnom. Vat.* 164 = 16; *idem apophthegma Socrati attribuitur in Corp. Par. (a)* f. 99^r, 3–4 (= *Exc. Par.* 29 [254], p. 80.8–9 Sternbach), *Max.* 18.39/39 (445.8 Ihm; PG 91.833.7–8 Combefis) *et* 28.15/15 (612.25–6 Ihm; PG 91.877.25–6 Combefis), *Anton.* 1.70 (PG 136.981.54–5 Migne) *et* 1.72 (PG 136.989.13–14 Migne), *Patm.* 31.29 (653.11 Sargologos) *et* 15.97 (397.23 Sargologos), *Ross.* 22.22 f. 54^r *et* 28.13 f. 60^r, *Ars.* 436.26–7 Walz (= *Socrates I C* 369 SSR 1.134 Giannantoni); *Isocrati attribuitur in Max.* 18 Semenov (178.8–10), *Patm.* 15 *cod. M* || cf. *Gnom. Pal.* 152 = *Flor. Mon.* 91 = *Flor. Leid.* 87 (anon.)

[*Max.*: *MaxU* 18 = PGL, *om.* I; *MaxU* 28 = PIL, *om.* G; *MaxII* 18/28 = CVAFH; *MaxI* 18/28 = RSO] 1 lemma Σωκράτους *habent Corp. Par.*, *Max.* 28, *Patm.* 15 (Ἴσοκράτους *cod. M*), *Ross.* 28, *Ars.* || ὁ αὐτὸς]
ὁ αὐτὸς = Σωκράτης *Max.* 18, *Patm.* 31, *Ross.* 22, *Ars.*: ὁ αὐτὸς =
→

16 *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 164 (67.18 Sternbach)¹

Of Lyco—Lyco the philosopher said that education is an inviolate sanctuary.²

¹ This saying is usually quoted from the *Appendix ex cod. ms. Florentino Parallelorum Sacrorum Ioannis Damasceni* ('Exc. Flor.') and therefore said to derive from the *Florilegium* of John of Damascus. The *Appendix* is in fact an excerpt made in 1781 by A. Sarti of *Laur. Plut.* 8.22. On the complex nature of the contents of *Laur. Plut.* 8.22 and (the sources of) the *Florilegium Laurentianum* contained in it, see, M. Richard, *Florilèges spirituels*, 1964, 495; D.M. Searby, *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition*, 1998, 48; S. Ihm, *Ps.-Maximus Confessor*, 2001, LXIV–LXVI. See also **17** and **20** n. 1.

² On (the importance of) 'education' in sayings attributed to Aristotle, see D.M. Searby, *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition*, 1998, on no. 24 p. 177–8 and 'Note VI: On Παιδεία' p. 271–3.

***17** *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 165 (68.10–1 Sternbach)

The same man (Lyco the philosopher),¹ asked what causes good people pain, said: "A wicked man enjoying good fortune."²

¹ In the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* the sequence is no. 164 = **16** (Lyco), 165 = **17** ('the same'), 166 (Gorgias), 167 = **19** (Gorgias). In the *Corpus Parisinum* **17** occurs in the (a) section ('Excerpta Parisina') no. 29 [254] f. 99^r under the heading 'sayings of the same (man)' starting from no. 24 [249] f. 98^r; the closest mention of Socrates preceding this heading is '(Sayings) of Socrates' at no. 1 [226] f. 97^r. In the *Corpus Parisinum* **16** and **19** occur in the (d) section ('Apophthegmata Parisina') nos. 26 (Glyco) and 27 ('the same'). See also **19**, **20** and **21** n. 1.

² In the anthologies which go under the names of Maximus Confessor, Antonius Melissa and Melissa Augustana, this saying is put in two chapters, that *On Good Fortune and Bad Fortune*, and that *On Grief and Despondency*.

¹ Ἰσοκράτης *Max.* 18 *Semenov* : Σωκράτης *MaxU* 28 *PIL*, *MaxII* 28 A, *Max.* 28, *Ross.* 28, *Anton.* 70 et 72 : οὗτος *MaxII* 28 H : *om.* *MaxII* 28 CVF, *MaxI* 28 RSO, *Patm.* 15, *Corp. Par.* ἡ ἐρωτηθεὶς δὲ *Corp. Par.* ἡ εἶπεν *Max.* 28, *Patm.* 15, *Ross.* 28, *Anton.* 72 : ἔφη *Max.* 18, *Patm.* 31, *Ross.* 22, *Anton.* 70, *Ars.* : *om.* *Corp. Par.* 2 πονηρὸς εὐτυχῶν] εὐτυχία (τῶν *add.* *MaxU* 28 *PIL*, *MaxII* A) πονηρῶν *Corp. Par.*, *Max.*, *Anton.*, *Ross.*, *Patm.*, *Ars.* ἡ *post* πονηρῶν *add.* *Combefis* (PG 91. 833.8–9) φιλεῖ γὰρ εὐημερία παράλογος ὕβρεως ἔργα προκαλεῖσθαι = *sub lemmate* Χαρικλείας *Corp. Par.* (a) f. 102^r, 7–8 (= *Exc. Par.* 297, p. 64 *Sternbach*), *Max.* 18.40/40 (445.18 *Ihm*), *Anton.* 1.70 (PG 136.984.1–2 *Migne*) *ex Heliodoro* 5.29.4

***18** *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 403 (152.7–9 Sternbach)

Λύκωνος.—Λύκων ἰδὼν γυναῖκα θρασεῖαν τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν πράττειν ἐθέλουσαν “οὔτε γυναῖκα” εἶπεν “ὁμοίαν ἀνδρὶ ἀποδέχομαι, οὔτε ἄνδρα ὅμοιον γυναικί.”

cf. *apophthegma quod Aristoteli attribuitur in Gnom. Vat. 144* (= *Apophth. Vind. 78, Flor. Mon. 165* = *Flor. Leid. 155; Anton. 1.60, 961C*) Ἀριστοτέλης (ὁ αὐτὸς *Apophth., Mon., Leid.*) θεασάμενος μειράκιον ὠραϊζόμενον (καλλωπιζόμενον *Mon., Leid.*) “οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ,” ἔφη, “ὅτι τῆς φύσεως ἄνδρα σε ποιησάσης ἑαυτὸν τεθήλυκας;” (= *Arist. Apophth. no. 64 Searby p. 111*) et *apophthegma quod Diogeni attribuitur in D.L. 6.65* (= *Diog. Sinop. V B 403 SSR 2.385 Giannantoni*)

***19** Ps.-Maximus Confessor, *Loci communes* 40.-/47.44 (739.2–3 Ihm)

Γλύκωνος.—ὁ αὐτὸς τοὺς ῥήτορας ἔφη ὁμοίους εἶναι τοῖς βατράχοις· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἐν ὕδατι κελαδεῖν, τοὺς δὲ πρὸς κλεψύδραν.

in *MaxII A et MaxI post apophthegma Aesopi; idem apophthegma Glyconi attribuitur in Corp. Par. (d) f. 148^v, 3–6* (= *Apophth. Par. 27, p. 482 Schenkl*), *Ars. 171.12–14 Walz (sequitur 16)*; *Gorgiae attribuitur in Gnom. Vat. 167* (69.1–2 Sternbach), *Flor. Mon. 173* (BT 4.280.14–16 Meineke), *Flor. Leid. 163* (25.10–12 Beynen); *post apophthegma Apollonii in Max. 47 Combefis* (PG 91.941.18–20), *sed in versione Latina Io. Ribitti p. 243 Lyconi attribuitur; de nomine Γλύκων v. ad 16* 1–3 *Glyco F 2 Orelli 2,200; Gorg. F 30 Buchheim, p. 100; 82 B 30 DK 2.306.30–1; Aesopica 22a Perry p. 253* (‘In omnibus his libris sequitur haec sententia statim post nr. 5 supra; sed additum est super verum, nempe postea quam traditum erat illud ὁ αὐτός, lemma Γλύκωνος, i.e. *Lyconis Troadensis philosophi*’)

[*Max. : om. MaxU; MaxII: A, om. CVFH; MaxI : RSO*] 1 Γλύκωνος *MaxI RSO, Ars. : Γλύκωνος καὶ τοῦτο MaxII A : om. Corp. Par., Gnom. Vat., Mon., Leid.* ἢ ὁ αὐτὸς *MaxII A, MaxI SO : οὗτος MaxI R : ὁ αὐτὸς* = Γλύκων ὁ σοφὸς *Corp. Par. : ὁ αὐτὸς* = Ἀπολλώνιος *Combefis* (hic = *Lyconis [in margine] vers. Lat.*) : ὁ αὐτὸς = Γοργίας ὁ ῥήτωρ *Mon., Leid. : Γοργίας Gnom. Vat. : Γλύκων ὁ σοφὸς Ars.* ἢ τοὺς ῥήτορας ἔφη] ἔλεγε τοὺς ῥήτορας *Ars. 2 τοῖς om. Mon. 3 πρὸς κλεψύδραν*] ἐν τῇ γῇ *Mon., Leid.*

***18** *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 403 (152.7–9 Sternbach)

Of Lyco—Having seen an overly bold woman who wished to do what men do, Lyco said, “I approve neither of a woman who is like a man, nor of a man who is like a woman.”¹

¹ This saying is preceded by one of the wrestler Lamon and followed by one of Menander; it appears to be untraceable (Sternbach does not cite any other testimonia).

***19** Ps.-Maximus Confessor, *Commonplaces* 40.-/47.44 (739.2–3 Ihm)

Of Glyco—The same man said that rhetors are like frogs, for the latter make a lot of noise in the water, the former (in a race) against the waterclock.¹

¹ In the corpus of the *Commonplaces* this saying is attested only in the shorter version (MaxI) and in one MS. of the longer version (MaxII). In the *Corpus Parisinum*, which is a source of the *Commonplaces*, this saying follows after **16** (Glyco) and is itself followed by **21** (Gnosis); see notes 1 to **17**, **20** and **21**. In the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* the saying is attributed to Gorgias; see **17** n. 1. According to Diels-Kranz on Gorgias 82 B 30 DK 2.306 the saying does not fit Gorgias at all. Regarding the attribution to Aesop, note that the seven MSS. in which according to Perry this saying is attested, all contain a version (MaxI) of the *Commonplaces* (compare Perry p. 247 with Ihm p. LIII–LXIV), and that in (MaxII and in) MaxI **19** follows after a saying attributed to Aesop (40.-/47.43 Ihm = *Aesopica* no. 5 Perry p. 249); see **20** n. 1.

- *20** Ps.-Maximus Confessor, *Loci communes* 40.31/47.39 (737.16–18 Ihm)

Γλύκωνος.—καθάπερ αἱ χελιδόνες τῷ συνεχεῖ τῆς λαλιᾶς τὴν ἡδονὴν τῆς ὁμιλίας ἀποβάλλουσιν, οὕτως οἱ ἀδόλεσχοι ὀχλήσεις συνεχεῖς ποιούμενοι ἀηδεῖς ἀποφαίνονται τοῖς ἀκρωμένοις.

hoc apophthegma Glyconi attribuitur in MaxU et MaxII, Patm. 23.100 (539.2–4 Sargologos); Lyconi attribuitur in Max. 47 Combefis (PG 91.941.21–4) 1–4 Glyco F 3 Orelli 2,200–2 1–3 καθάπερ—ποιούμενοι = homæoma anon. APM 74 (23.36–8 Schenkl), Corp. Par. (d) f. 154^r, 17–20 (= Apophth. Par. 102, p. 486 Schenkl) 1–2 οἱ ἀδόλεσχοι καθάπερ αἱ χελικόντες—ἀποβάλλουσιν = homæoma anon. Gnom. Hom. 58 (5.12. 31–2 Elter), App. Vat. 1.272 (196.18–19 Sternbach); de nomine Γλύκων v. ad 16

[Max.: MaxU: PGL, om. I; MaxII: CVAFH; MaxI: RSO] 1 Γλύκωνος MaxU PL, MaxII CVAFH, Patm.: om. MaxU G, MaxI: Λύκωνος Combefis 2 ἀπολύουσιν Patm.: διαφθείρουσιν App. Vat. 3 ἀδόλεσχοι MaxII VH, Gnom. Hom., Corp. Par. || ἀναιδεῖς MaxU G

- *21** Ps.-Maximus Confessor, *Loci Communes* 71.26/42.20 (1049.7 Ihm)

Γλύκωνος.—γνώσις θεοῦ διὰ μακροθυμίας καὶ πραότητος εἰς ἄνδρα γνωρίζεται.

hoc apophthegma Glyconi attribuitur in MaxU, MaxII, MaxI (PG 91.921.44–5 Combefis), Anton. 2.89 (PG 136.1220.21–2 Migne), Patm. 8.59 (240.5 Sargologos) 1–2 Glyco F 1 Orelli 2,200 || γνῶσις—γνωρίζεται = homæoma anon. = APM 26 (14.28–9 Schenkl) et Corp. Par. (d) f. 148^r, 6–7 (= Apophth. Par. 28, p. 482 Schenkl); de nomine Γλύκων v. ad 16

[Max.: MaxU: L, om. PGI; MaxII: CVAFH; MaxI: RSO] 1 Γλύκωνος MaxU L, MaxII CVAF, MaxI, Anton., Patm.: om. MaxII H, APM, Corp. Par.

***20** Ps.-Maximus Confessor, *Commonplaces* 40.31/47.39 (737.16–18 Ihm)

Of Glyco—Just as swallows by continuous chatter ruin the pleasure of company, so babblers who create continuous annoyance prove unpleasant to those who listen.¹

¹ The *Corpus Parisinum*, which lists the sayings in alphabetical order and is a source of the *Commonplaces*, has in the Gamma-section no. 26 = **16** (Glyco), 27 = **19** ('the same') and 28 = **21** (Γνῶσις = 'Knowledge') and in the Kappa-section no. 102 = **20** (Καθάπερ = 'Just as'). Nos. 28 = **21** and 102 = **20** derive from the anthology *APM*, a collection of sayings ordered alphabetically according to the first letter of the saying. The compiler of the *Commonplaces* put **16** in ch. 17 *On Education*, **19** and **20** in ch. 47 *On Loquacity* and **21** in ch. 42 *On Patience and Forbearance*. For **16** see **17** n. 1; for **21** see **21** n. 1. As for **19** and **20**, in ch. 47 of the shorter version (MaxI) **19** ('the same') and **20** ('Just as') are put in that order after a saying attributed to Aesop and both are attributed to Glyco. In the edition of Combefis both are put after a saying of Apollonius of Tyana (see the *apparatus* of **19**). In the longer version (MaxII) MS. A puts **20** after Apollonius and **19** after Aesop, attributing both to Glyco; MSS. CVFH omit **19** and put **20** after Apollonius, again attributing it to Glyco. The version with a different order of chapters (MaxU), which is based upon MaxII, has the same sequence as MSS. CVFH of MaxII.

***21** Ps.-Maximus Confessor, *Commonplaces* 71.26/42.20 (1049.7 Ihm)

Of Glyco—Knowledge of God, through patience and gentleness towards man, is made known.¹

¹ This saying occurs in a chapter which consists almost exclusively of Christian sayings on patience and forbearance. The attribution to Glyco may be explained as follows (cp. H. Schenkl, *SB Wien* 115 (1888) 482 and 508 n. 2). The compiler of the *Commonplaces* used the *Corpus Parisinum* as the source here. In the *Corp. Par.* this saying occurs without attribution (i.e., without the lemma of Glyco) in the Gamma-section of an alphabetically arranged series of sayings similar to *APM*, placed there due to its initial gamma (Γνῶσις). Sayings **16** (Glyco) and **19** ('the same') precede it. The compiler of the *Commonplaces* probably assumed that **21** also belonged to Glyco and therefore attributed it to him when he placed **21** in the chapter on patience and forbearance.

***22** Dicta a Stobaeo excerpta

vide quae Photius de dictis a Stobaeo collectis dicit, *Bibliotheca* 167 114a14–115b17, ubi Lyco inter philosophos a Stobaeo laudatos nominatur (114b8 [CB 2.156.8 Henry]).

V. IN TITULO LAUDATUS

***23** Plutarchus, *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat*, 1 14E (BT 1.28.4–11 Paton et alii)

ὅτι δὲ τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ λεγομένων οἱ σφόδρα νέοι τοῖς μὴ δοκοῦσι φιλοσόφως μὴδ' ἀπὸ σπουδῆς λέγεσθαι χαίρουσι μᾶλλον καὶ παρέχουσιν ὑπηκόους ἑαυτοὺς καὶ χειροθήεις, δηλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμῖν. οὐ γὰρ μόνον τὰ Αἰσώπεια μυθάρια καὶ τὰς ποιητικὰς ὑποθέσεις καὶ τὸν Ἄβαντον τὸν Ἡρακλείδου καὶ τὸν Λύκωνα τὸν Ἀρίστωνος διερχόμενοι, (ἀλλὰ καὶ) τὰ περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν δόγματα μεμιγμένα μυθολογία μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἐνθουσιῶσι. 5

1–9 *Heracl. Pont. F 73 Wehrli* = *Aristo F 33 Wehrli* 4–9 *IK 53* (1997) *T 169.6 p. 251* 6 τὸν Ἄβαντον] v. *Heracl. Pont. F 74–5 Wehrli*

[GXvZ(V)WCY(J)p(q)Ma(t)ANhSD; Crönert = 'emendationes viri docti W. Crönert ex eius *Moralium exemplo nunc Gottingae in philologorum seminario adservato depromptae*', vid. *BT 1.354 et 366*] 5 (ἀλλὰ) post ὑποθέσεις manus posterior in α, Wehrli; G. von Reutern, *Plutarchs Stellung zur Dichtkunst. Interpretation der Schrift De audiendis poetis*, diss. Kiel 1933, 2–3; Crönert 7 ἀλλὰ καὶ inserunt G²X³V ('hiatus pausa excusandus') : (καὶ) τὰ (ἄλλα) Crönert

***22** Sayings Excerpted by Stobaeus

See what Photius says about the sayings collected by Stobaeus, *Library* 167 114a14–115b17, where Lyco is mentioned among the philosophers quoted by Stobaeus (114b8 [CB 2.156.8 Henry]).

V. NAMED IN A TITLE

***23** Plutarch, *How a Young Man Should Study Poetry*, 1 14E (BT 1.28.4–11 Paton *et alii*)

But¹ it is clear to us that the very young get more enjoyment out of those philosophical discourses that do not seem to be stated in a philosophical, or even a serious manner, and (that) they lend a submissive and willing ear to them. For they derive inspiration coupled with pleasure from going through not only the fables of Aesop and the tales of the poets and the *Abaris* of Heraclides and the *Lyco* of Aristo, but also² the doctrines about the souls when these are mixed with mythology.³

¹ Plutarch opens this essay by saying that one should let those people whose palate is more sensitive than their mind, decide the question whether it is true what the poet Philoxenus says, i.e. that those meats that are not meat and those fish that are not fish, are the most pleasant to the taste.

² The translation follows the text of MSS. G²X³V; Wehrli follows the text of MS. α (the text of Maximus Planudes) as corrected by a later hand. According to Wehrli this (1) puts the climax indicated by *and also* at the right place, and (2) makes sure that the phrase ‘the doctrines about the souls mixed with mythology’ specifically refer to the *Abaris* and the *Lyco*. (1) The rhythm of the Greek and (2) the difficulty in construing the phrase ‘the doctrines about the souls mixed with mythology’, however, appear to favor the text as printed here. Problem (2) would be solved by Crönert’s conjecture.

³ On this fragment see Wehrli on Aristo F 33 p. 66 and M. Gigante, ‘Aristone di Ceo biografo dei filosofi’, *Studi Classici e Orientali* 46 (1996), 17–23.

CONCORDANCE

The following tables relate the texts collected in this edition (SFOD) to that of F.Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentare*, Band 6: *Lykon*, zweite, ergänzte und verbesserte Auflage, Basel & Stuttgart 1968

Wehrli	SFOD	SFOD	Wehrli
1	2	1	2; 3; 5; 8; 10; 11;
1 ^I	3A		12; 15; 16; 18; 22;
2	1		23; 24; 25; 27
3	1	2	1
4	4	3A	1 ^I
5	1	3B	6
6	3B	4	4
7	8	5	13
8	1	6	14
9	7	7	9
10	1	8	7
11	1	9	19
12	1	10	20
13	5	11	17
14	6	12	26
15	1	13	28
16	1	14	29
17	11	15	30
18	1	16	21
19	9		
20	10		
21	16		
22	1		
23	1		
24	1		
25	1		
26	12		
27	1		
28	13		
29	14		
30	15		

INDEX OF LYCONIAN TEXTS EITHER PRINTED OR ENTERED IN THE APPARATUS OR IN A SEPARATE LIST

The numbers in bold refer to the fragments; *Dicta* to 'IV. Sayings'.

ANECDOTA GRAECA Bekker		CARMEN DE FIGURIS (saec. 4–5 pCn)	
3.1314.8–13	app. 13	148–50	app. 12
ANTIGONUS CARYSTIUS (saec. 3 aCn)		CHOEROBOSCUS → GEORGIUS CHOERO-	
ap. Athenaeum, <i>Deipnosophistae</i> ,		BOSCUS	
12.69 547D–548B		CICERO, MARCUS TULLIUS (106–43 aCn)	
(BT 3.207.8–208.21 Kaibel)	8	<i>De Finibus</i>	
ANTONIUS MELISSA (saec. 11–12 pCn)		5.5.13 (BT 13.161.27–162.5	
<i>Loci communes</i>		Schiche)	11
1.70 (PG 136.981.54–5		<i>Tusculanae Disputationes</i>	
Migne)	app. 17	3.32.77–8 (BT 13.356.18–357.10	
1.72 (PG 136.989.13–14)	app. 17	Pohlenz)	9
2.89 (PG 136.1220.21–2)	app. 21	CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 2–3 pCn)	
APM		<i>Stromata</i>	
26 (14.28–9 Schenkl)	app. 21	1.14.63.5 (GCS 2.40.9–12	
74 (23.36–8)	app. 20	Stählin-Früchtel)	3A
APOPHTHEGMATA PARISINA → CORPUS		2.21.129.9 (GCS 2.183.19–184.1)	10
PARISINUM		CORPUS PARISINUM (saec. 9–10 pCn)	
APPENDIX VATICANA		f. 99 ^r , 3–4 (= Exc. Par. 29 [254]	
1.272 (196.18–19 Sternbach)	app. 20	p. 80.8–9 Sternbach)	app. 17
APULEIUS MADAURENSIS (saec. 2 pCn)		f. 148 ^v , 3–6 (= Apophth. Par.	
<i>Apologia</i>		27, p. 482 Schenkl)	app. 19
36 (BT 2.1. 41.16–42.8 Helm)	15	f. 148 ^v , 6–7 (= Apophth. Par.	
ARSENIUS (saec. 15–16 pCn)		28, p. 482)	app. 21
<i>Violetum</i>		f. 148 ^v , 2–3 (= Apophth. Par.	
171.12–14 Walz	app. 19	26, p. 482)	app. 16
171.15	app. 16	f. 154 ^r , 17–20 (= Apophth. Par.	
436.26–7	app. 17	102, p. 486)	app. 20
ATHENAEUS NAUCRATITES (saec. 2–3 pCn)			
<i>Deipnosophistae</i>		DIOGENES LAERTIUS (saec. 3 pCn)	
12.69 547D–548B (BT 3.207.8–		<i>Vitae Philosophorum</i>	
208. 21 Kaibel) = ANTIGONUS		5.61–4 (BT 1.352.14–354.13	
CARYSTIUS	8	Marcovich)	4
<i>Deipnosophistarum Epitome</i>		5.65–74 (BT 1.354.18–360.15)	1
2.2.96.16–25 Peppink	app. 8	5.65 (BT 1.354.21–355.1)	<i>Dicta</i> no. 1

70 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

5.65 (BT 1.355.3–5)	Dicta no. 2	HERODIANUS ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 2 pCn)	
5.66 (BT 1.355.12–16)	Dicta no. 3	<i>De inflexione nominum</i>	
5.66 (BT 1.355.16–19)	Dicta no. 4	3.2 (BT 2.1.716.23–30 Lentz)	13
5.66 (BT 1.355.19–356.1)	Dicta no. 5		
<i>Excerptum Byzantinum</i>		INSCRIPTIONES	
2.257.27 Marcovich	app. 1	<i>BCH</i>	
2.257.27–258.5	app. 1	26 (1902) 262–3 no. 12	app. 6
2.258.5–6	app. 1	53 (1929) 449–50 no. 30	app. 6
		<i>CID</i>	
EUSTATHIUS THESSALONICENSIS (saec. 12 pCn)		IV 63	6
		<i>FD</i>	
<i>Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam</i>		III 3 (1932) 139–40 no. 167	app. 6
1.110 (1.30.1–3 Stallbaum)	app. 8	<i>GGA</i>	
EXCERPTA FLORENTINA		175.3 (1913) 167–70 no. 1	app. 6
2.13.40 (BT 4.226.10–11 Meineke)		<i>Hesperia</i>	
(= Laur. α14,192 f. 154 ^v)	app. 16	11 (1942) 287–92 no. 56,	
EXCERPTA PARISINA → CORPUS		1–32 & 71	5
PARISINUM		<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i>	
		II 334 (= II ² 791)	app. 5
FLORILEGIUM LAURENTIANUM →		II ² 791, 1–32 & 71	5
EXCERPTA FLORENTINA		<i>SEG</i>	
FLORILEGIUM LEIDENSE		32.118, 1–32 & 71	5
163 (25.10–12 Beynen)	app. 19	<i>SIG</i>	
FLORILEGIUM MONACENSE		461	app. 6
173 (BT 4.280.14–16		491	app. 5
Meineke)	app. 19		
FLORILEGIUM ROSSIANUM		Ps.-MAXIMUS CONFESSOR	
21.30 f. 52 ^v	app. 16	<i>Loci Communes</i>	
22.22 f. 54 ^v	app. 17	17.45/54 (418.24 Ihm; PG 91.	
28.13 f. 60 ^r	app. 17	825.1–2 Combefis)	app. 16
		18.39/39 (445.8 Ihm; 178.8–10	
GEORGIUS CHOEROBOSCUS (saec. 9 pCn)		S.; PG 91.833.7–8 C.)	app. 17
<i>Scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini</i>		28.15/15 (612.25–6 Ihm;	
<i>canones isagogicos de flexione</i>		PG 91.877.25–6 C.)	app. 17
<i>nominum</i>		40.31/47.39 (737.16–18 Ihm;	
268.25–8 Gaisford (GG 4.1.		PG 91.941.21–4 C.)	*20 , app. 20
259.9–16 Hilgard)	app. 13	40./47.44 (739.2–3 Ihm;	
GNOMICA BASILEENSIA (saec. 11 pCn)		PG 91.941.18–20 C.)	*19 , app. 19
150 (66.22 Kindstrand)	app. 16	71.26/42.20 (1049.7 Ihm;	
GNOMICA HOMOIOMATA		PG 91.921.44–5 C.)	*21 , app. 21
58 (5.12.31–2 Elter)	app. 20	MELISSA AUGUSTANA (Sargologos)	
GNOMOLOGIUM VATICANUM (saec. 14 pCn)		Patm. 8.59 (240.5)	app. 21
no. 164 (67.18 Sternbach)	16	Patm. 15.97 (397.3)	app. 17
no. 165 (68.10–1)	*17	Patm. 23.100 (539.2–4)	app. 20
no. 167 (69.1–2)	app. 19	Patm. 31.29 (653.11)	app. 17
no. 403 (152.7–9)	*18		

PHOTIUS (saec. 9 pCn)		SUDA (exeunte saec. 10 pCn)	
<i>Bibliotheca</i>		ε 2766 s.v. Ἐπίχαρμος (LG 1.2.	
167 114a 8 (CB 2.156.8 Henry)	22	393.21–9 Adler)	14
PLUTARCHUS CHAERONENSIS (saec. 1–2 pCn)		ρ 273 s.v. ῥοίακες (LG 1.4.	
<i>Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat</i>		304.25–6 Adler)	app. 1
1 14E (BT 1.28.4–11 Paton et al.)	*23	ω 265 s.v. ὠτοκάταξις (LG 1.3.	
<i>De exilio</i>		629.21 Adler)	app. 1
14 605A–C (BT 3.525.23–526.15 Paton et al.)	2	THEMISTIUS (c. 317–388 pCn)	
RUTILIUS LUPUS (ineunte saec. 1 pCn)		<i>Orationes</i>	
<i>De figuris</i>		21 255b–c (BT 2.35.22–36.10	
2.7 (32.1–27 Brooks)	12	Downey-Norman)	7
STOBAEUS, JOANNES (saec. 5 pCn)		21 255c (BT 2.36.8–9)	Dicta no. 6
<i>Anthologium</i>		THEODOSIUS ALEXANDRINUS →	
3.40.3/4 (3.736.8–737.4 Hense)	app. 2	GEORGIUS CHOEROBOSCUS	
		VITA ARISTOTELIS HESYCHII	
		9 (p. 82.18–21 Düring) = VITA	
		ARISTOTELIS MENAGIANA	
		p. 402.20–3 Westermann	3B

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

This index lists all passages other than the Lyconian texts listed in the Index of Texts, cited in the upper (or lower) apparatus (app.) and (selectively) in the notes to the translation (n.).

AESCHINES SOCRATICUS (saec. 4 aCn)	F 33	app. 23
F VI A 47 SSR 2.606	ARISTO CHIUS (saec. 3 aCn)	
Giannantoni	F 334 SVF 1.76 von Arnim	app. 7
F VI A 52 SSR 2.609	ARISTOTELES (384–322 aCn)	
(= F 10 Ditmar)	<i>Apophthegmata</i>	
AESOPICA	24 Searby p. 102	app. 16
5 Perry p. 249	64 Searby p. 111	app. 18
22a Perry p. 253	<i>Ethica Nicomachea</i>	
ANTIGONUS CARYSTIUS (saec. 3 aCn)	10.9 1179 b 29–31	app. 10
F 23 Dorandi	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
F 24 Dorandi	F 3 Düring p. 260	app. 3A
Wilamowitz 83–4	F 295,1 Gigon	app. 15
Wilamowitz 84–5	p. 26a.33–6 Gigon	
Wilamowitz 85	(= p. 10.19–22 Rose)	app. 3B
ANTIPATER TARSENSIS (saec. 2 aCn)	p. 215 Rose	app. 15
F 6 SVF 3.244 von Arnim	T 76b Düring p. 427	app. 11
ANTONIUS MELISSA (saec. 11–12 pCn)	AUCTOR AD HERENNIUM (saec. 1 aCn)	
<i>Loci communes</i>	4.49.63	app. 12
1.60 (PG 136.961C Migne)	AUGUSTINUS, AURELIUS (354–430 pCn)	
1.70 (PG 136.984.1–2)	<i>De Civitate Dei</i>	
ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA	14.8	app. 9
7.112 (= Plan. 3.92)		
APOLLODORUS ATHENIENSIS (saec. 2 aCn)	CHRYSIPPUS SOLEUS (saec. 3 aCn)	
244 F 350 FGrH	F 1 SVF 2.1 von Arnim	app. 2
APOPHTHEGMATA PARISINA	CICERO, MARCUS TULLIUS (106–43 aCn)	
26 (Schenk1)	<i>Tusculanae Disputationes</i>	
27	3.31.75	9 n. 2
28	3.31.76	9 n. 1
102	3.32.77	9 n. 1
APOPHTHEGMATA VINDOBONENSIA	CLEANTHES ASSIUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
78 (Wachsmuth)	F 463 SVF 1.103 von Arnim	app. 2
ARCHEDEMUS TARSENSIS (saec. 2 aCn)	F 577 SVF 1.130	app. 9
F 2 SVF 3.262 von Arnim	CORPUS PARISINUM	
ARISTO CEUS (saec. 3 aCn)	f.102 ^r , 7–8 (= Exc. Par. 297,	
F 3 Wehrli	p. 64 Sternbach)	app. 17
F 4	CRANTOR SOLEUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
F 5	T 4f Mette	app. 7
F 6	CRITOLAUS PHASELITES (saec. 2 aCn)	
F 7	F 1 Wehrli	app. 2
F 10	F 3	app. 3B
F 31	F 4	app. 3A

DIOGENES LAERTIUS (saec. 3 pCn)		GLYCO	
<i>Vitae Philosophorum</i>		F 1 Orelli 2, p. 200	app. 21
3.41–3	app. 1	F 2 Orelli 2, p. 200	app. 19
4.3	app. 7	F 3 Orelli 2, p. 200	app. 20
4.6	app. 1	GNOMOLOGIUM PALATINUM	
4.22	app. 7	152 Wachsmuth	app. 17
4.41	app. 1	GNOMOLOGIUM VATICANUM (saec. 14 pCn)	
5.11–16	app. 1	50 Sternbach	app. 16
5.19	app. 16	52	app. 1
5.39	app. 1	144	app. 18
5.50	app. 1	164	app. 17
5.51–7	app. 1	GORGAS LEONTINUS (saec. 5–4 aCn)	
5.52	app. 1 , app. 3B	82 B 30 DK 2.306	19 n. 1
5.58	4 n. 4	82 B 30 DK 2.306.30–1	app. 19
5.61–4 = 4	app. 1	F 30 Buchheim p. 100	app. 19
6.65	app. 18		
7.1	app. 2	HELIODORUS (saec. 3 pCn?)	
7.12	app. 5	<i>Aethiopica</i>	
7.168	app. 2	5.29.4	app. 17
7.179	app. 2	HERACLIDES PONTICUS (saec. 4 aCn)	
7.184	2 n. 3	F 73 Wehrli	app. 23
10.16–21	app. 1	HERMIPPUS SMYRNAEUS (saec. 3 aCn)	
DIODORUS TYRIUS (saec. 2 aCn)		F 57 Wehrli = 1026 F 74	
F 1 Wehrli	app. 3A	FGrH	app. 1
DIOGENES BABYLONIUS (saec. 2 aCn)		HIERONYMUS RHODIUS (saec. 3 aCn)	
F 2 SVF 3.210 von Arnim	app. 2	F 3A White (= F 2 Wehrli)	app. 3B
DIOGENES SINOPEUS (saec. 4 aCn)		F 4 White (= F 4 Wehrli)	app. 1
V B 403 SSR 2.385		F 6 White	app. 1
Giannantoni	app. 18	F 3 Wehrli	app. 1
EPHORUS CUMAEUS (saec. 4 aCn)		INSCRIPTIONES	
70 T 28ab FGrH	app. 1	<i>FD</i>	
EPICARMUS SYRACUSANUS (saec. 5 aCn)		III 1.275	app. 6
T 1 PCG 1.8 Kassel-		III 1.275.1	app. 6
Austin	app. 14	<i>Hesperia</i>	
T 5 PCG 1.9	app. 14	46 (1977) 121 no. 54	app. 5
2 T 1 CGF 1.1 Kaibel		<i>IG</i> ²	
p. 88	app. 14	678,28	app. 5
EUDEMUS RHODIUS (saec. 4 aCn)		788	5 n. 2
F 125 Wehrli	app. 15	<i>IK</i> 53 (1997)	
EXCERPTA PARISINA → CORPUS		T 169.1 p. 250	app. 6
PARISINUM		T 169.2 p. 250	app. 5
FLORILEGIUM LEIDENSE		T 169.3 p. 250–1	app. 11
87 Beynen	app. 17	T 169.4 p. 251	app. 9
155	app. 18	T 169.5 p. 251	app. 2
FLORILEGIUM MONACENSE		T 169.6 p. 251	app. 23
91 Meineke	app. 17	T 169.7 p. 251	app. 15
165	app. 18	T 169.8 p. 251–2	app. 4
		T 169.9 p. 252–5	app. 1
		T 169.10 p. 255–6	app. 8

74 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

T 169.11 p. 256	app. 10	QUINTILIANUS (30/40–c. 100 pCn)	
T 169.12 p. 257	app. 7	<i>Institutio Oratoria</i>	
SEG		9.3.99	app. 12
32.119	app. 5		
SIG		SOCRATES (?469–399 aCn)	
585.40	app. 6	I C 29 SSR 1.54 Giannantoni	app. 9
585.44	app. 6	I C 369 SSR 1.134	app. 17
LEUCIPPUS ELEATES (saec. 5 aCn)		SPEUSIPPUS ATHENIENSIS (saec. 4 aCn)	
67 A 37 DK II 79	10 n. 3	F 20 Isnardi Parente (= T 11	
67 A 37 DK II 79.31–3	app. 10	Tarán)	app. 7
LYCO PYTHAGOREUS (saec. 4 aCn)		T 35 Tarán	app. 8
57 A 1 DK	app. 1	STEPHANUS BYZANTIUS (saec. 6 pCn)	
1110 FGh IV A 7.423–9	app. 1	<i>Ethnica</i>	
LYCOPHRON CHALCIDENSIS (saec. 4–3 aCn)		s.v. Κραστός p. 382 Meineke	app. 14
100 T 6 TrGF 1.274 Snell	14 n. 1	STOBAEUS, JOANNES (saec. 5 pCn)	
		<i>Anthologium</i>	
		2.31.35	app. 16
Ps.-MAXIMUS CONFESSOR		STRABO (saec. 1 aCn–1 pCn)	
<i>Loci Communes</i>		<i>Geographica</i>	
18.40/40 (445.18 Ihm;		13.1.48	13 n. 1
PG 91.833.8–9 Combeffis)	app. 17	STRATO LAMPSACENUS (saec. 3 aCn)	
40.–/47.43	app. 19, 19 n. 1	F 3 Wehrli	app. 3B
MUSONIUS RUFUS (saec. 1 pCn)		F 4	app. 3A
p. 43,8–16 Hense	app. 2	F 4, I	app. 2
		F 9	app. 1
		F 10	app. 4
PANTHOIDES MEGARICUS (saec. 3 aCn)		F 12	app. 11
II Q 1 SSR 1.471			
Giannantoni	app. 1	THEMISTIUS (c. 317–388 pCn)	
PHILODEMUS (ineunte saec. 1 aCn)		<i>Orationes</i>	
<i>Academicorum Historia</i>		21.255a	7 n. 1
col. 24.32–6 Dorandi	2 n. 3	THEOPHRASTUS ERESIUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
col. 25.8–11	2 n. 3	no. 1 FHS&G app. ad 34–8	app. 1
col. 30.8–10	2 n. 3	no. 11.5	app. 3A
PHORMIS COMICUS (saec. incert.)		no. 18.19	app. 11
T 1 PCG 1,174 Kassel-Austin	app. 14	no. 25	app. 2
PHOTIUS (saec. 9 pCn)		no. 351	app. 15
<i>Bibliotheca</i>		no. 385	11 n. 1
167 114a14–115b17	22	no. 482	11 n. 1
PLATO (c. 429–347 aCn)		no. 498	11 n. 1
<i>Leges</i>		no. 590	11 n. 1
740 B	app. 1	no. 672	11 n. 1
PLUTARCHUS CHAERONENSIS (saec. 1–2 pCn)		THUCYDIDES (c. 455–c. 400 aCn)	
<i>De exilio</i>		2.96.1	1 n. 15
13	2 n. 1	4.98.4	1 n. 15
PRAXIPHANES MYTILENENSIS (saec. 4–3 aCn)		ZENO CITIEUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
F 3 Wehrli	app. 3B	F 1 SVF 1.3 von Arnim	app. 2

INDEX OF NAMES

The numbers refer to the translations of the fragments and to the notes (n.) to the translations. In the case of **1** and **4** the paragraph numbers are added in parentheses.

- Abus **4** (63)
 Academy, the **2**; **7** n. 1; **10** n. 2
 Aegina **1** (70; 71)
 Aemilianus *see* Sicinius, Aemilianus
 Aeolis **6**; n. 4
 Aeschylus **2** n. 1
 Aesop **19** n. 1; **20** n. 1
 — fables of **23**
 Aetolian(s) **6**; n. 3
 Agatho **1** (73)
 Alcibiades **9**
 Alexandria, in the Troad **6**; n. 4
 Alopeke, deme of **5**
 Ameinias **4** (64)
 Amphictyony, Council of the **6**; n. 3; 6
 Amphio **1** (70)
 Anaxarchus of Abdera **8** n. 1
 Antigonus of Carystus **1** (67); **8**
 Antigonus II Gonatas **1** (65); n. 3; 8
 Antiochus I Soter **1** n. 7
 Antiochus II Theos **1** (67); n. 7
 Antipater of Tarsus **2**; **10** n. 2
 Antiphon of Erchia **5**
 Antonius Melissa **17** n. 2
 Apollo, sanctuary in Delphi of **6**
 Apollonius of Tyana **20** n. 1
 Apuleius of Madaura **15** n. 1
 Arcesilaus of Pitane **1** (68)
 Arcesilaus, father of Strato **4** n. 4
 Arcesilaus, nephew of Strato **4** (61; 62; 63; 64); n. 4
 Archedemus of Tarsus **2**; **10** n. 2
 Aristides **4** (62)
 Aristo of Ceos **1** (70; 74); **2**; **3B**; **4** (64); **7**; n. 1; **10** n. 3; **11**
 — *Lyco* **23**
 Aristo of Chius **10** n. 2
 Aristomachus **1** (70)
 Aristomenes **5**
 Aristotle **2**; **3A**; **3B**; **7**; **11** n. 1; **15**; **16** n. 2
 — *On the Generation of Animals* **15**
 — *On the History of Animals* **15**
 — *On the Parts of Animals* **15**
 — *Problemata* **15**
asphaleia **6**; n. 7; 8
 Assembly (of the people) **5**
 Assos **2**
 Astyanax I, father of Lyco **1** (65); **6**
 Astyanax II, nephew of Lyco **1** (69); n. 12; 18
asylia **6**; n. 7; 8
ateleia **6**; n. 8
 Athanis **4** (62)
 Athenaeus of Naucratis **8** n. 1; 4
 Athenian(s) **1** (67); **2**
 Athens **1** (69); **2**; n. 1; **4** (61); **8**; **14**
 Attalus I of Pergamum **1** (67); n. 6

 Babylon **2**
 Boeotian(s) **6**; n. 3
 Bulo **1** (70; 71); n. 18; 19

 Cadmus **14**
 Callinus of Hermione **1** (70; 71; 72; 73; 74); n. 18; 19
 Callistratus, son of Telesinus **5**
 Callixenus **6**
 Ceos **1** (74); **2**
 Chalcedon **7**
 Chares **1** (73)
 Chian(s) **6**; n. 3
 Chimarus, father of Epicharmus **14**
 Chrysippus of Soli **2**; n. 3; **9** n. 2
 Cicero *see* Tullius Cicero
 Citium **2**
 Claudius Maximus **15**; n. 4
 Cleanthes of Assos **2**; **7**; **9**; n. 2; **10** n. 2
 Clement of Alexandria **10** n. 2
 Cleupatrus **6**
 Clitomachus **2** n. 3
 Conon **8**
 Cos **14**

- Council (*boulê*) **5**
 Crantor of Soli **7**
 Crastus, town of **14**
 Crates of Thebes **7**
 Crito of Chalcedon **1** (72; 74)
 Critolaus of Phaselis **2; 3A; 3B; 10** n. 2
- Daïppus **4** (63)
 Delphi(ans) **6**; n. 3; 4; 5
 Delphic council **6** n. 3
 Demetrias, tribe of **5**
 Demetrius **1** (72; 74)
 Demetrius, father of Heraclides **1** (71)
diatribê **2** n. 2; **3A** n. 1; **4** n. 5
 Dio **1** (73)
 Diocles **4** (62; 63)
 Diodorus of Tyrus **3A**
 Diogenes of Babylon **2; 10** n. 2
 Diogenes Laertius **2** n. 4
 — *Lives of the Philosophers* **1** n. 1
 — *Life of Arcesilaus* **1** (68)
 — *Life of Lyco* **1** n. 1
 — *Life of Strato* **4** n. 1
 Diomedon **5**; n. 2
 Diophantus **1** (71); **4** (63)
 Dracontides of Erchia **5**
 Dromo **4** (63)
- Eparmostus **6**
 Epicharmus of Syracuse **14**
 Epicrates **4** (62; 63)
 Epicurus **9** n. 2
 Eresus **2**
eta **14**
 Eudemus of Rhodes **15**
 Euetes, comic poet **14**
 Eumenes I of Pergamum **1** (67); n. 6
 Euphranor **1** (73)
 Euphronius of Paeania **1** (74)
 Euripides **2** n. 1
 Euryclides, son of Micio **5**
 Euxenides, comic poet **14**
- Glyco **1** n. 4; **17** n. 1; **19**; n. 1; **20**; n. 1; **21**; n. 1
 — *see also* Lyco I
 Gorgias of Leontini **17** n. 1; **19** n. 1
 Gorgylus **4** (62)
- Hades **1** (68)
hairesis **3A** n. 1
 Halcyoneus, son of Antigonus Gonatas **1**
 n. 8
 Heracleus **1** (70)
 Heraclides, son of Demetrius **1** (71)
 Heraclides Ponticus
 — *Abaris* **23**
 Heraeus **4** (63)
 Herillus of Carthago **10** n. 2
 Hermias **1** (73)
 Hermione **1** (74)
 Hermippus of Smyrna **1** (67)
 Herodian of Alexandria **13** n. 2
 Herodotus **2** n. 1
hieromnemon(es) **6**; n. 3; n. 6
 Hieronymus of Rhodes **1** (68); **3B**
 Hilara **1** (73)
 Hippocrates **4** (62)
 Homer **2** n. 1
- Illeia* **1** n. 5
 Ilium, Games of **1** (67); **1** n. 5
- John of Damascus **16** n. 1
- Kephisia, deme of **5**
- Lamon, wrestler **18** n. 1
 Lampsacus **2; 4** n. 3
 Lampyrio, nephew of Strato **4** (61; 63);
 n. 4
 Leucimus **10**
 Leucippus **10** n. 3
 Lyceum, the **2; 3A; 7**
 Lyciscus **3B; 10** n. 3
 Lyco I, of Troas **1** (65; 68; 69); n. 12; 16;
 17; **2; 3A; 3B; 4** (62; 64); **5**; n. 7; **6**;
 n. 5; **7**; n. 1; **8**; n. 1; **9**; n. 2; **10**; n. 2;
11; 12; 13; nn. 1, 2; **14; 15**; n. 3; **16**;
17; 18; 22
 — *On Drunkenness* **12** n. 1
 — *see also* Glyco
 Lyco II, brother of Astyanax **1** (69); n. 12;
 18
 Lyco III, inheritor of property in Athens **1**
 (70); n. 12
 Lyco IV, inheritor of the Peripatos **1** (70);
 n. 12

- Lyco V, nephew of Lyco 1 (70); n. 12
 Lyco VI, executor of the will of Lyco I 1
 (71; 72; 73; 74); 1 n. 16; 17; 19
 Lyco VII, of Iasus, the Pythagorean 1
 (69); 14 n. 1
 Lyco VIII, poet of epic verses 1 (69)
 Lyco IX, poet of epigrams 1 (69)
 Lycomedes 1 (70)
 Lycophron of Chalcis 14 n. 1
 Lycus of Rhegium 15 n. 3
- Macedon 2 n. 1
 Marathon, deme of 5
 Ps.-Maximus Confessor
 — *Commonplaces* 17 n. 2; 19 n. 1; 20 n. 1; 21 n. 1
 Medias 1 (72)
 Megara, in Sicily 14
 Melissa Augustana 17 n. 2
 Menander 18 n. 1
 Menodora 1 (73)
 metics 5 n. 5
 Micio 5
 Micrus 1 (72; 73)
 Mnesigenes 4 (62)
 Muses, the 8; n. 2
 Myl(l)us 14
- Nicoma[chus] 6
 Noemo 1 (73)
- Odeum, the 2; 2 n. 3
 Olympia 1 (66)
 Olympichus 4 (62; 63; 64)
omega 14
 Ophelio 1 (73)
- Paeania, deme of 1 (74)
paideia 16 n. 2
 Palladium, the 2; n. 3
 Panaetius of Rhodes 10 n. 2
 Panthoides of Athens 1 (68)
 Parthians 2
 Pasithemis 1 (72)
 Peripatos, the 1 (70); n. 14; 2; 3A; n. 2; 7
 n. 1; 8; 9 n. 2; 10 n. 3
 Phaselis 2
 Philocrates, son of Tisamenus 4 (64)
 Phocian(s) 6 n. 3
- Phormus 14
 Phoryscides, son of Aristomenes 5
 Photius 22
 Phormio 3B
 Piso *see* Pupius Piso
 Plato 3A; 8; 15
 Plutarch
 — *On Exile* 2 n. 1
 Posidonius 1 (73)
 Posidonius of Apamea 10 n. 2
 Praxiphanes 3B
 Praxiteles 3B
prodikia 6; n. 8
proedria 6; n. 8
 Prytanis 3B
 Pudentilla, wife of Apuleius 15 n. 2
 Pupius Piso, Marcus 11 n. 1
 Pythia, festival of the 6 n. 5
 Pytho 1 (70)
- Samos 14
scholê 2 n. 2; 3A n. 1
 Sicanians 14
 Sicily 2 n. 1; 14
 Sicinius, Aemilianus 15; n. 2
 Siciis, mother of Epicharmus 14
 Simias 4 (63)
 Simonides 2 n. 1
 Socrates 9; 17 n. 1
 Soli 2
 Speusippus of Athens 7; 8
 Stagira 2
 Stephanus of Byzantium 13 n. 1
 Stoa, the 2; 7 n. 1; 10 n. 2
 Stobaeus, Joannes 22
strategoi 5
 Strato of Lampsacus 1 (65; 68); 2; 3A;
 3B; 4 (61; 64); n. 4; 11; 15 n. 3
 Syracuse 14
 Syrus 1 (73; 74)
- Tarsus 2
 Telesinus 5
telos 10 n. 2
 Themistius 7 n. 1
 Theo 1 (73)
 Theophemus, son of Timocles 5
 Theophrastus of Eresus 2; 3A; 3B; 11;
 n. 1; 15

78 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

Theopomus of Lamptraï **5**

Thurii **2** n. 1

Timocles **5**

Tisamenus **4** (64)

Tityrus, father of Epicharmus **14**

Tragasai **13** n. 1

Troad **1** (65); n. 11; **2**; **6** n. 4; **13**; n. 1

Tullius Cicero, Marcus **9** n. 1; 2

Xenocrates of Chalcedon **7**

Zeno of Citium **2**; **10** n. 2

2

Hieronymus of Rhodes The Sources, Text and Translation

Stephen White

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	81
ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS	85
TEXTS	
I. Life	
Origin 1–2	96
In Athens 3–6	100
Sayings 7	106
II. Writings	
Books 8–9	108
Physics	
On vision 10	112
Ethics	
On the good life 11–24	116
On anger 25–27	144
On wine 28–30	150
On education 31–32	156
On love 33–36	158

Rhetoric	
On Isocrates 37–39	168
Literature	
Studies 40	178
On poets 41–43	182
On myths 44–46	190
On philosophers 47–53	198
On Socratics 54–56	210
III. Uncertain	
Life 57–58	214
Rhodes 59–60	218
On poets 61	229
IV. Doubtful 62–63	240
V. Rejected 64–67	244
CONCORDANCES	248
INDEX OF SOURCES	253
INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED	256
INDEX OF NAMES	271

INTRODUCTION

This edition of ancient texts relating to Hieronymus of Rhodes continues the efforts of Project Theophrastus to update and supplement Wehrli's *Schule des Aristoteles* by providing thorough collections of evidence for the life and work of Aristotle's colleagues, students, and successors. Modelled on the new editions of Theophrastus (FHS&G), Demetrius of Phalerum (SOD), Dicaerchus of Messana (Mirhady), and now Lyco of Troas (SFOD), it provides texts, translations, and textual and exegetical notes. The large majority of texts are not fragments in the strict sense but testimony: reports or claims about Hieronymus' life or work rather than quotations or paraphrases of his writings. Since this often aggravates problems of interpretation and attribution, I have in many cases supplied more context from a source than Wehrli or similar collections have. My primary concern in so doing has been to include material important for evaluating the testimony and addressing questions of attribution or interpretation. The boundaries of an excerpted text are therefore not a reliable indicator of what derives from Hieronymus.

The texts are presented in five sections (I–V). The first two, which form the bulk of the collection, contain texts that I consider certain or very likely to refer to the life or work of Hieronymus of Rhodes: first, evidence for his *Life* (texts **1–7**), then material relating to his *Writings* (**8–56**). A third section contains texts that I think are somewhat less likely to refer to his life or work but still deserve serious consideration; in labelling these texts *Uncertain* (**57–61**), I mean to indicate only that the question of attribution is especially problematic, not to imply that the attribution of all preceding texts is certain. Two further sections contain texts that are either likely or very likely to refer not to the Peripatetic from Rhodes but rather to the homonymous historian from Cardia: two labelled *Doubtful* (**62–3**), and four labelled *Rejected* (**64–7**). The basis for these assessments is in many cases provided in notes to the translations, often in the first two sections (I–II) and in every case thereafter (III–V).

Material in the first three sections is arranged by subject matter as indicated by brief headings. Section II is arranged broadly by field or discipline in the sequence traditionally used for Aristotle's corpus: first, "physics" (or perhaps "logic": **10**), then "ethics" (**11–36**), rhetoric

(**37–9**), literature (**40–6**), and finally reports about earlier philosophers (**47–56**). Within these broad groups, texts are arranged by topics, many of which correspond to attested or likely titles of works. Under each topic, texts that cite titles appear first; the others are then arranged in various ways, mainly on the basis of their subject matter (including its chronological sequence, as in **49–53**) but sometimes according to its sequence in a source (as in **25–6**). Parallel texts that address the same specific topic are grouped together under a single number (as in **16A–D**). Four tables list references to Hieronymus' Rhodian origin (**1B**), to his place in the Peripatetic tradition (**3B**), to attested or conjectured titles of his works (**8A**), and to general assessments of his work (**8B**).

The primary criterion for including texts is explicit attribution by name. I have also included some parallel texts which do not name Hieronymus but may shed further light on his work or its transmission; these appear as secondary texts following explicitly attributed texts (**13B**, **36B–C**, **42B–C**, **43B–C**, **46B**, **59B–C**, **61B–C**).

The texts printed here are based on previous editions and scholarship, which are the sole basis for reports of manuscript readings. The edition which served as starting point is listed for each text; but in many cases, the text here printed differs, and it should never be assumed to be identical. I have also provided some additional information about variant readings found in other editions and scholarship.

Texts are supplied with a dual apparatus: the first lists parallel texts and testimonia, the second lists textual variants. Neither list purports to be exhaustive.

The apparatus of textual parallels contains mainly two kinds of information: 1) references to closely related material in other ancient texts (including some which cite Hieronymus by name) which may be useful for interpreting the text or the transmission of its content; and 2) references to modern editions of ancient works or authors named or discussed in the text (including occasional cross-references to other Hieronymus texts). This apparatus also provides references to standard modern sources of information about figures for whom source collections are unavailable. References to the corresponding texts in Wehrli's collection are provided in the left margin at the line where Wehrli's texts begin. Texts not included by Wehrli are marked by an asterisk in the left margin.

The critical apparatus reports textual variants of mainly two sorts: 1) manuscript readings that affect sense or logic; and 2) editorial and scholarly emendations, supplements, and conjectures. Variants in word order and orthography (including names, where they are very common) are generally not reported unless they bear on interpretation. The apparatus is based on those found in the editions listed for each text, though in some cases this evidence is reported in a simplified or modified form based on subsequent scholarship. A list of sigla for the primary manuscripts used in recension, and occasionally a list of the manuscripts themselves, appears at the beginning of the apparatus, unless the text directly follows another from the same work.

The translations are intended mainly to assist interpretation of the texts. They seek to combine accuracy in sense with clarity and consistency in terminology, and to avoid solecism and tendentious simplification. Translations are followed by brief notes indicating the context of the excerpted text; many also discuss questions of attribution, transmission, or interpretation. Additional notes identify or clarify material mentioned or discussed in the text, and indicate or address textual or interpretive questions.

Lists of the abbreviations and editions used in this collection are provided below. Abbreviations not found there follow LSJ and *OLD* (some in slightly fuller form). A Concordance correlates the texts in this collection with those in the collections of Hiller (1879) and Wehrli (1955, 1969). An Index of Sources lists all texts printed in this collection and all other texts that mention Hieronymus by name. An Index of Passages Cited lists all other passages cited in an apparatus or in notes to the translations. An Index of Names lists all those mentioned in the texts or notes.

A preliminary collection of texts and translations was prepared for a conference on the Early Hellenistic Lyceum, sponsored by Project Theophrastus and held at the University of Texas at Austin in March 2001. The edition has been greatly improved both by papers and discussion at the conference and by suggestions from many before and since, including Andrew Barker, Gábor Betegh, Hans Gottschalk, Carolyn Higbie, Peter Lautner, Andrea Martano, Elisabetta Matelli, David Mirhady, Gwyn Morgan, Alex Mourelatos, Sara Rappe, and Richard Sorabji. I am especially grateful to Tiziano Dorandi, Bill Fortenbaugh,

Bob Sharples, and Peter Stork for valuable advice and criticism. Steve Foy provided editorial assistance; his help was supported by a Ben Vaughan Faculty Fellowship, for which I thank our College of Liberal Arts. Finally, I warmly thank Diane Smith for handling the final preparation of this edition with efficiency and grace.

ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS USED

A. Modern works and authors

Annas	J. Annas, <i>The Morality of Happiness</i> . Oxford 1993
Arrighetti	G. Arrighetti, "Ieronimo," <i>SIFC</i> 3 (1954) 111–28
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de Correspondence Hellénique</i>
Blinkenberg	See <i>ILind</i>
BT	Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig
Bühler	W. Bühler, <i>Zenobii Athoi proverbia</i> , v. 1 <i>Prolegomena</i> . Göttingen 1982
CA	<i>Collectanea Alexandrina</i> , ed. J. U. Powell. Oxford 1925
CAG	<i>Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca</i>
CB	Collection des Universités de France publié sous le patronage de l'Association G. Budé. Paris
CCSL	<i>Corpus Christianorum Scriptorum Latinorum</i>
Combès	See Damascius
CPF	<i>Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini</i> , Parte 1: <i>Autori Noti</i> , v. 1. 1–2. Florence 1989–92
CPG	<i>Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum</i> , ed. E. L. Leutsch, F. G. Schneidewin. Göttingen 1836–51
CrE	<i>Cronache Ercolanesi</i>
CSEL	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
Dalfino	M. C. Dalfino, "Ieronimo di Rodi: la dottrina della <i>vacuitas doloris</i> ," <i>Elenchos</i> 14 (1993) 277–304
Davies	<i>Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta</i> , ed. M. Davies. Göttingen 1988
Diogène	<i>Diogène Laërce: Vies et doctrines des philosophes illustres</i> , ed. M.-O. Goulet-Cazé. Paris 1999
DK	<i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> , ed. H. Diels, W. Kranz. Berlin 1951 ⁶
DPhA	<i>Dictionnaire des philosophes anciens</i> , v. 1–3, ed. R. Goulet. Paris 1989–2000
Edelstein	E. J. L. Edelstein, <i>Asclepius: a Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies</i> . Baltimore 1945
<i>Eudemus</i>	<i>Eudemus of Rhodes</i> = <i>RUSCH</i> 11, ed. I. Bodnar, W. W. Fortenbaugh. New Brunswick 2002
<i>FGrH</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , ed. F. Jacoby. Leiden 1926–58
<i>FHG</i>	<i>Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i> , ed. C. Müller. Paris 1841–70
FHS&G	<i>Theophrastus of Ereus: Sources for his Life, Writing, Thought and Influence</i> , ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh, P. Huby, R. Sharples, D. Gutas. Leiden 1992

- Fortenbaugh W. W. Fortenbaugh, *Quellen zur Ethik Theophrasts*. Amsterdam 1984
- Gaisford T. Gaisford, *Paroemiographi Graeci*. Oxford 1836
- GCS *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte*
- GL *Grammatici Latini*, ed. H. Keil, H. Hagen. Leipzig 1855–80
- Gottschalk H. Gottschalk, *Heracleides of Pontus*. Oxford 1980
- Hiller E. Hiller, "Hieronymi Rhodii Peripatetici Fragmenta," in *Satura Philologa* (Festschrift H. Sauppe). Berlin 1879
- Hiller-Robert F. Hiller von Gaertringen, C. Robert, "Relief von dem Grabmal eines Rhodischen Schulmeisters," *Hermes* 37 (1902) 121–46
- Hornblower J. Hornblower, *Hieronymus of Cardia*. Oxford 1981
- HSCP *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
- IG *Inscriptiones Graecae*
- IGM *Inscriptiones Graecae metricae*, ed. T. Preger. Leipzig 1891
- ILind *Lindos: Fouilles de l'acropole*, vol. 2 *Inscriptions*, ed. C. Blinkenberg. Berlin & Copenhagen, 1941
- KA *Poetae Comici Graeci*, ed. R. Kassel, C. Austin. Berlin & New York 1983–
- LG *Lexicographi Graeci*
- LIMC *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, ed. J. Boardman et al. Zurich, Munich, Dusseldorf 1981–99
- LCL Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA
- LSJ *A Greek-English Lexicon*, ed. H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. S. Jones. Oxford 1940⁹
- MW *Fragmenta Hesiodica*, ed. R. Merkelbach, M. L. West. Oxford 1967
- OCT Oxford Classical Texts. Oxford
- OLD *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P. G. W. Glare. Oxford 1982
- Parke-Wormell H. W. Parke, D. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*. Oxford 1956
- PG *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Graeca*, ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris 1857–66
- PHerc Papyrus Herculanensis
- PL *Patrologiae cursus completus, series Latina*, ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris 1844–91
- PM E. Pfuhl, H. Möbius, *Die östgriechischen Grabreliefs*. Mainz 1977–79
- PMG *Poetae Melici Graeci*, ed. D. L. Page. Oxford 1962
- POxy *The Oxyrhynchus Papyrus*. London 1898–
- Radermacher L. Radermacher, *Artium Scriptores: Reste der voraristotelischen Rhetorik* = Sitzungsberichte der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl. 227.3. Vienna 1951

<i>RE</i>	<i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , ed. G. Wissowa et al. Stuttgart 1894–1978
RUSCH	<i>Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities</i>
SA	<i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> , ed. F. Wehrli. Basel 1967–92
SC	<i>Sources Chrétiennes</i>
SDF	vid. Aristo Ceus
SFOD	vid. Lyco
SH	<i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> , ed. H. Lloyd-Jones, P. Parsons. Berlin & New York 1983
SOD	vid. Demetr. Phal.
SSR	<i>Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae</i> , ed. G. Giannantoni. Naples 1990
SVF	<i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i> , ed. H. von Arnim. Leipzig 1903–5
Tarn	W. W. Tarn, <i>Antigonos Gonatas</i> . Oxford 1913
TGF	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , ed. A. Nauck. Leipzig 1889
TGrF	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , v. 1, ed. B. Snell. Leipzig 1971; vid. Aesch., Soph.
W = Wehrli	F. Wehrli, <i>Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler</i> = SA v. 10. Basel & Stuttgart 1969 ²
West	<i>Iambi et Elegi Graeci</i> , ed. M. L. West. Oxford 1971–2
West (1983)	M. L. West, <i>The Orphic Poems</i> . Oxford, 1983
West (1992)	M. L. West, <i>Ancient Greek Music</i> . Oxford, 1992
White (2002)	S. White, “Happiness in the Hellenistic Lyceum,” in <i>Eudaimonia and Well-Being</i> = <i>Apeiron</i> 35 Suppl. (2002) 69–93
Wilamowitz	U. von Wilamowitz Moellendorff, <i>Antigonos von Karystos</i> = <i>Philologische Untersuchungen</i> 4. Berlin 1881 (denueo Berlin 1965)

B. Ancient and Byzantine works and authors

Aesch.	<i>Aeschylus</i> , ed. S. Radt = TGrF 3. Göttingen 1985
Aesop. <i>Fab.</i>	<i>Aesopi Fabulae: Aesopica</i> , ed. B. E. Perry. Urbana 1952
Aët.	<i>Aëtius: Doxographi Graeci</i> , ed. H. Diels. Berlin 1879
Alex. Aet.	<i>Alexandri Aetoli testimonia et fragmenta</i> , ed. E. Magnelli. Florence 1999
[Alex.] <i>Probl.</i>	[Alexander Aphrodisiensis], <i>Problemata: Physici et medici Graeci minores</i> , v. 1.3–80, ed. I. L. Ideler. Berlin 1841
Antig. Caryst.	<i>Antigone de Caryste: Fragments</i> , ed. T. Dorandi. Paris 1999 [CB]
Antiochus	H. J. Mette, “Philon von Larissa und Antiochos von Askalon,” <i>Lustrum</i> 28/9 (1986/7) 9–63
Apost.	Michael Apostolius: CPG 2.231–744
Aratus Latinus	<i>Commentariorum in Aratum Reliquiae</i> , ed. E. Maas. Berlin 1898

Arcesilaus	Arcesilaus Pitanaeus: H. J. Mette, "Zwei Akademiker heute: Krantor und Arkesilaos," <i>Lustrum</i> 26 (1984) 7–94
Aristo Ceus (SFOD)	P. Stork, "Aristo of Ceos: The Sources, Text and Translation," in <i>Aristo of Ceos</i> = RUSCH 13, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh, S. A. White. New Brunswick 2004 <i>Aristo von Keos</i> = SA v. 6, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1968 ²
Aristoph.	Aristophanes: KA 3.2
Ar. Byz. Epit.	<i>Aristophanis Historiae animalium Epitome</i> , ed. S. P. Lambros. Berlin 1885 [CAG Suppl. 1.1]
Arist.	<i>Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta</i> , ed. V. Rose. Leipzig, 1886 [BT] I. Düring, <i>Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition</i> . Göteborg 1957
[Arist.] Probl. Ined.	<i>Problemata Inedita: Aristotelis Opera Omnia</i> , v. 4.1, ed. U. C. Bussemaker. Paris 1857
Aristox.	<i>Aristoxenos</i> = SA v. 2, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1967 ²
Arius Did.	Arius Didymus: apud Stobaeum
Arnob.	<i>Arnobii Adversus nationes libri VII</i> , ed. C. Marchesi. Turin 1934
Ath.	<i>Athenaei Naucratis Deipnosophistarum Libri XV</i> , ed. G. Kaibel. Leipzig 1887–90 [BT]
Athenag. Leg.	<i>Athenagoras: Legatio pro Christianis</i> , ed. M. Marcovich. Berlin 1990
Basilius Minimus	E. Norden, "Scholia in Gregorii Nazianzeni Orationes inedita," <i>Hermes</i> 27 (1892) 606–42
Bodl.	Bodleiana, vel potius Recensio B: Gaisford 1–120; cf. Bühler 126–55
Callim.	<i>Callimachus</i> , ed. R. Pfeiffer. Oxford 1949–53
Callisth.	Callisthenes Olyntheus: 124 <i>FGrH</i> 2B.631–57
Carneades	Carneades Cyrenaeus: H. J. Mette, "Weitere Akademiker heute: von Lakydes bis zu Kleitomachos," <i>Lustrum</i> 27 (1985) 39–148
Chamaeleon	<i>Phainias von Eresos, Chamaeleon, Praxiphanes</i> = SA v. 9, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1969 ²
Cic. Ac.	<i>Academicorum librorum reliquiae cum Lucullo</i> , ed. O. Plasberg. Stuttgart 1922 [BT t. 42]
Div.	<i>De divinatione, De fato, Timaheus</i> , ed. R. Giomini. Stuttgart 1975 [BT t. 46]
Fin.	<i>De finibus bonorum et malorum libri quinque</i> , ed. L.D. Reynolds. Oxford 1998 [OCT]
Orat.	<i>Orator</i> , ed. R. Westman. Stuttgart 1980 [BT t. 5]
Tusc.	<i>Tusculanae disputationes</i> , ed. M. Pohlenz. Stuttgart 1918 [BT t. 44]
Clearchus	<i>Klearchos</i> = SA v. 3, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1969 ²

- Clemens *FHG* 4.364–5; cf. A.R. Dyck, “Notes on Platonic Lexicography in Antiquity,” *HSCP* 89 (1985) 84–6
- Clem. Alex. *Protr.* *Clemens Alexandrinus*, v. 1: *Protrepticus und Paedagogus*, ed. O. Stählin. Berlin 1905 [GCS 12]
- Strom.* *Clemens Alexandrinus*, v. 2: *Stromata Buch I–VI*, ed. O. Stählin. Berlin 1906 [GCS 15]
- ps.-Clem. *Hom.* *Die Pseudoklementinen*, v. 1: *Homilien*, ed. J. Irmscher, F. Paschke, B. Rehm. Berlin 1969² [GCS 42]
- Coisl. Coisl.iana, vel potius Coisl.inianus 177: Gaisford 120–54; cf. Bühler 277–9
- Critolaus *Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler* = SA v. 10, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1969²
- Cyrill. C. *Julian.* *Contra Julianum imperatorem: Cyrilli Alexandriae Opera quae reperi potuerunt omnia*, v. 9.489–1064, ed. E. Spanheim. Paris 1863 [PG 76]
- Damasc. *Princ.* *Damascius: Traité des Premiers Principes*, ed. L. G. Westerink, J. Combès. Paris 1986–91 [CB]
- Demetr. *Eloc.* *Demetrii Phalerei qui dicitur De elocutione libellus*, ed. L. Radermacher. Stuttgart 1901 [BT]
- Demetr. Phal. (SOD) P. Stork, “Demetrius of Phalerum: The Sources, Text and Translation,” in *Demetrius of Phalerum* = RUSCH 9, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh, E. Schütrumpf. New Brunswick 2000 *Demetrius von Phaleron* = SA v. 4, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1968²
- Dicaearch. D. Mirhady, “Dicaearchus of Messana: The Sources, Text and Translation,” in *Dicaearchus of Messana* = RUSCH 10, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh, E. Schütrumpf. New Brunswick 2001 *Dikaiarchos* = SA v. 1, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1967²
- Diodorus Diodorus Tyrius: *Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler* = SA v. 10, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1969²
- D.L. *Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum*, ed. M. Marcovich. Stuttgart & Leipzig 1999 [BT]
- Diogen. vulg. Diogenianus vulgatus: *CPG* 1.177–320; cf. Bühler 188
- Dionys. Chalc. Dionysius Chalcus: West 2.58–60
- D.H. *Isocr.* *Denys d’Halicarnasse: Opusculs Rhétoriques*, v. 1: *Les orateurs antiques*, ed. G. Aujac. Paris 1978 [CB]
- Dionys. Scyt. Dionysius Scytobrachion: 32 *FGrH* 1.228–57
- Emped. Empedocles Agrigentinus: 31 DK 1.276–375 50 *TGrF* 1.189; cf. 238 *TGrF* 1.327
- Ennius *The Tragedies of Ennius: the Fragments*, ed. H. D. Jocelyn. Cambridge 1967
- Epaphroditus E. Luenzner, *Epaphroditus grammatici quae supersunt*. Diss. Bonn 1866

- Epicurus
Et. Gud. *Epicurea*, ed. H. Usener. Stuttgart 1887
Etymologicum Gudianum v. 1 (α–β), ed. A. De Stefani. Leipzig 1909
- Et. Mag.* *Etymologicum Magnum*, ed. T. Gaisford. Oxford 1848
- Eudemus
Eudemos von Rhodos = *SA* v. 8, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1969²
- Eur.
Euripides: *TGF* 361–716
- Eustath. *In Il.* *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*, ed. M. van der Valk. Leiden 1971–87
- In Od.* *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam*, ed. G. Stallbaum. Leipzig 1825
- Gal. *Simpl. medic.* *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus: Claudii Galeni Opera Omnia*, v. 11.379–892, ed. C. G. Kuhn. Leipzig 1826 (denuo Hildesheim 1965)
- Gnom. Vat.* *Gnomologium Vaticanum e codice Vaticano Graeco 743*, ed. L. Sternbach. Berlin 1963
- Greg. Cyp.
Leid. Gregorius Cyprius: *CPG* 1.349–78
Codex Leidensis: CPG 2.53–92
- Mosq.* *Codex Mosquensis: CPG* 2.93–130
- Heraclid. Pont. *Herakleides Pontikos* = *SA* v. 7, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1967²
- Herillus
Herillus Carthaginiensis: *SVF* 1.91–3
- Hermias *In Phaedr.* *Hermeias von Alexandrien in Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*, ed. P. Couvreur. Paris 1901 (denuo Hildesheim 1971)
- Hermippus
Hermippos der Kallimacheer = *SA Suppl.* 1, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1974
- Herodicus Crat. I. Düring, *Herodicus the Crateteian: A Study in Anti-Platonic Tradition*. Stockholm 1941
- Hesych.
Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon, v. 1 (α–δ), v. 2 (ε–ο), ed. K. Latte. Copenhagen 1953–6
- Hesychius Milesius
[Hesych.] *Vir. illustr.* *Vita Aristotelis “Menagiana”*: Düring (vid. Arist.) 80–93
Pseudo-Hesychii Milesii, De viris illustribus: D.L. v. 2.89–138 Marcovich
- Hieron. *Adv. Iovin.* *Adversus Jovinianum: Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis Presbyteri Opera Omnia*, v. 2.221–352, ed. D. Vallarsi. Paris 1883 [*PL* 23]
- Comm. in Osee* *Commentaria in Osee Prophetam: Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera Omnia*, v. 1.6.1–158, ed. M. Adriaen. Turnhout 1969 [*CCSL* 76]
- Hieron. Aegyp.
Hieron. Card.
Hippobotus
Hieronymus Aegyptius: 787 *FGh* 3C.799–800
Hieronymus Cardius: 154 *FGh* 2B.829–35
M. Gigante, “Frammenti di Ippoboto,” in *Omaggio a Piero Treves*, ed. A. Mastrocinque. Padua 1983; vid. Gigante, *Parola del Passato* 220 (1985) 69

- Iambl. *De an.* *Iamblichus, De anima*, ed. J. Finamore, J. M. Dillon. Leiden 2002
- Lact. *Div. Inst.* *Divinae Institutiones: L. Caeli Firmiani Lactanti Opera Omnia*, v. 1, ed. S. Brandt. Leipzig 1890 [CSEL 19]
- Lex. Αἶμ. *Lexicon Αἰμωδεῖν*: F. W. Sturz, *Etymologicum Graecae linguae Gudianum, et alia grammaticorum scripta*, 617–31. Leipzig 1818 (denuo Hildesheim 1973)
- Lex. Bachm. *Lexicon Bachmann: Anecdota Graeca* v. 1, ed. L. Bachmann. Leipzig 1828
- Lyco (SFOD) P. Stork, W. W. Fortenbaugh, T. Dorandi, “Lyco of Troas: The Sources, Text and Translation,” in *Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes* = RUSCH 12, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh, S. A. White. New Brunswick 2004
- Macar. *Lykon* = SA v. 6, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1968²
- Men. *Rhet.* *Macarius Chrysocephalus: CPG* 2.135–227
- Oenomaus *Menander Rhetor*, ed. D. A. Russell, N. G. Wilson. Oxford 1981
- Olymp. *Vita Plat.* J. Hammerstaedt, *Die Orakelkritik des Kynikers Oenomaus*. Frankfurt 1988
- Orig. *C. Celsum* A. Westermann, *Biographoi: Vitarum Scriptores Graeci Minores*. Braunschweig 1845 (denuo Amsterdam 1964)
- Orph. *Origène: Contre Celse*, ed. M. Borret. Paris 1967–76 [SC 132, 136, 147, 150, 227]
- Orphic. *Orpheus: 1 DK* 1.1–20
- Panaetius *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, ed. O. Kern. Berlin 1922
- Phaenias F. Alesse, *Panezio di Rodi: Testimonianze*. Naples 1997
- Philod. *Acad. hist.* M. van Straaten, *Panaetii Rhodii Fragmenta*. Leiden 1962³
- Piet.* *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes* = SA v. 9, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1969²
- Rhet.* *Filodemo: Storia dei Filosofi. Platone e l'Accademia*, ed. T. Dorandi. Naples 1991
- Sto. *Philodemi De pietate, pars prior*, ed. A. Schober. Königsberg 1923 = *CrE* 18 (1988) 67–125
- Phot. *Lex.* *Philodemi Volumina Rhetorica*, ed. S. Sudhaus. Leipzig 1892–96 [BT]
- Plat. T. Dorandi, “Filodemo, Gli Stoici (PHerc. 155 e 339),” *CrE* 12 (1982) 91–133
- Plin. *NH* *Photii patriarchae Lexicon* v. 1 (α–δ), ed. C. Theodoridis. Berlin 1982
- Plut. *Platonis Opera*, ed. J. Burnet. Oxford 1900–7
- Pline l'Ancien: Histoire Naturelle, Livre II*, ed. A. Ernout, R. Pépin. Paris 1947 [CB]
- Pline l'Ancien: Histoire Naturelle, Livre 36*, ed. J. André, R. Bloch, A. Rouveret. Paris 1981 [CB]
- Plutarchi Moralia*, v. 7, ed. F. H. Sandbach. Leipzig 1967 [BT]

<i>Apophth. Lac.</i>	<i>Apophthegmata Laconica</i> : ---, v. 2, ed. W. Nachstädt, W. Sieveking, J. B. Titchener. Leipzig 1935 [BT]
<i>Conj. prae.</i>	<i>Coniugalia praecepta</i> : ---, v. 1, ed. W. R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, H. Gärtner. Leipzig 1974 [BT]
<i>De cohib.</i>	<i>De cohibenda ira</i> : ---, v. 3, ed. W.R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, W. Sieveking. Leipzig 1929 [BT]
<i>De Isid.</i>	<i>De Iside et Osiride</i> : ---, v. 2, ed. W. Nachstädt, W. Sieveking, J. B. Titchener. Leipzig 1935 [BT]
<i>De lib. educ.</i>	<i>De liberis educandis</i> : ---, v. 1, ed. W. R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, H. Gärtner. Leipzig 1974 [BT]
<i>De rect. rat.</i>	<i>De recta ratione audiendi</i> : ---, v. 1, ed. W. R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, H. Gärtner. Leipzig 1974 [BT]
<i>De Sto. rep.</i>	<i>De Stoicorum repugnantiiis</i> : ---, v. 6.2, ed. M. Pohlenz, R. Westman. Stuttgart 1959 [BT]
<i>Non posse</i>	<i>Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum</i> : ---, v. 6.2, ed. M. Pohlenz, R. Westman. Stuttgart 1959 [BT]
<i>Praec. ger. reip.</i>	<i>Praecepta gerendae rei publicae</i> : ---, v. 5, ed. C. Hubert, H. Drexler. Leipzig 1960 [BT]
<i>QC</i>	<i>Quaestiones convivales</i> : ---, v. 4, ed. C. Hubert. Leipzig 1938 [BT]
<i>Reg. et imp.</i>	<i>Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata</i> : ---, v. 2, ed. W. Nachstädt, W. Sieveking, J. B. Titchener. Leipzig 1935 [BT]
<i>Sept. sap. conv.</i>	<i>Septem sapientium convivium</i> : ---, v. 1, ed. W. R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, H. Gärtner. Leipzig 1974 [BT]
<i>Ages.</i>	<i>Agesilaus: Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae</i> , v. 3.2, ed. K. Ziegler. Leipzig 1973 [BT]
<i>Alex.</i>	<i>Alexander</i> : ---, v. 2.2, ed. K. Ziegler. Leipzig 1974 [BT]
<i>Arist.</i>	<i>Aristides</i> : ---, v. 1.1, ed. K. Ziegler. Leipzig 1969 ⁴ [BT]
ps.-Plut.	<i>Plutarchi Eclogae proverbiorum</i> : CPG 1.321–48
Polemo	M. Gigante, "I Frammenti di Polemone Academico," <i>Rendiconti della Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti</i> n.s. 51. Naples 1977
Polem. <i>Perieg.</i>	L. Preller, <i>Polemonis Periegetae Fragmenta</i> . Leipzig 1838 (denuo Amsterdam 1964)
Porphyrio	<i>Pomponi Porphyrii Commentum in Horatium Flaccum</i> , ed. A. Holder. Innsbruck 1894 (denuo Hildesheim 1967)
Porph.	<i>Porphyrius: Fragmenta</i> , ed. A. Smith. Leipzig & Stuttgart 1993 [BT]
Posidonius	L. Edelstein, I. G. Kidd, <i>Posidonius: The Fragments</i> . Cambridge 1988 ²
Praxiphanes	<i>Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes</i> = SA v. 9, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1969 ²
Pyrrho	F. Decleva Caizzi, <i>Pirrone: Testimonianze</i> . Naples 1981
Rufinus	<i>De numeris oratorum</i> , ed. H. Keil. Leipzig 1874 [GL 6]

- Ruf. *Recog.* *Die Pseudoklementinen*, v. 2: *Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung*, ed. B. Rehm, F. Paschke. Berlin 1965 [GCS 51]
- Satyrus *Vita Eur.* *Satiro: Vita di Euripide*, ed. G. Arrighetti = *Studi Classici e Orientali* 13. Pisa 1964
- Sch. *Ap. Rhod.* *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera*, ed. C. Wendel. Berlin 1958
- Sch. *Ar.* *Scholia in Aristophanis Lysistratam = Scholia in Aristophanem* v. 2.4, ed. J. Hangard. Groningen 1996
- Sch. *Clem. Protr.* GCS 12.293–318; vid. Clem. Alex. *Protr.*
- Sch. *Eur.* *Scholia in Euripidem*, ed. E. Schwarz. Berlin 1887
- Sch. *Hes. Scut.* A. Martano, “Scolii e glosse allo Scudo di Eracle dal manoscritto Ambrosiano C 222 inf.,” *Aevum* 76 (2002) 151–200
- Sch. *Il.* *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*, ed. H. Erbse. Berlin 1969–83
- Sch. *Nic. Ther.* *Scholia in Nicandri Theriaka*, ed. A. Crugnola. Milan & Varese 1971
- Sch. *Od.* *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, ed. W. Dindorf. Oxford 1855
- Sch. *Plat.* *Scholia Platonica*, ed. W. C. Greene. Haverford PA 1938
- Sch. *Soph.* *Scholia in Sophoclis tragoedias vetera*, ed. P. N. Papageorgius. Leipzig 1888 [BT]
- Seleucus M. Müller, *De Seleuco Homérico*. Diss. Göttingen 1891
- Sen. *De ira* L. Annaei Senecae *Dialogorum libri duodecim*, ed. L. D. Reynolds. Oxford 1977 [OCT]
- QN L. Annaei Senecae *Naturalium quaestionum libros*, ed. H. M. Hine. Stuttgart 1996 [BT]
- Fragmenta L. Annaei Senecae *Opera*, v. 4.16–43, ed. F. Haase. Leipzig 1902 [BT]
- Soc. Socrates: SSR 1.3–341
- Soc. *Ep.* *Socraticorum Epistulae*: L. Koehler, *Die Briefe des Sokrates und die Sokratiker = Philologus Suppl.* 20.2. Leipzig 1928
- Soph. *Sophocles*, ed. S. Radt = *TGrF* 4. Göttingen 1977 West 2.165–6
- Soph. *iun.* Sophocles junior: 62 *TGrF* 1.208
- Sotion Sotion = *SA Suppl.* 2, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1978
- Speusippus L. Tarán, *Speusippos of Athens*. Leiden 1981
- Steph. *Byz.* *Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum quae supersunt*, ed. A. Meineke. Berlin 1849
- Stob. *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologii libri duo priores qui inscribi solent Eclogae physicae et ethicae*, ed. C. Wachsmuth. Berlin 1884
- Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium libri duo posteriores*, ed. O. Hense. Berlin 1894–1912 (denuo Berlin 1958)

Strabo	<i>Strabo: Geographica</i> , ed. G. Kramer. Berlin 1844–52
Strato	<i>Straton von Lampsakos</i> = SA v. 5, ed. F. Wehrli. Basel & Stuttgart 1969 ²
Suda	<i>Suidae Lexicon</i> , ed. A. Adler. Stuttgart 1928–38 [LG 1]
Terpander	D. A. Campbell, <i>Greek Lyric</i> v. 2. Cambridge MA 1988 [LCL]
Tertull.	<i>Tertullianus: De anima</i> , ed. J. H. Waszink. Amsterdam 1947
Theodoret.	<i>Theodoreti Graecarum affectionum curatio</i> , ed. J. Raeder. Leipzig 1904 [BT]
Theo Alexandrinus	vid. Vita Arati
Theophr.	Theophrastus Eresius: FHS&G
Timachidas	Timachidas Rhodius: vid. <i>ILind</i> ; cf. <i>SH</i> 366–7
Timo	Timo Phliasius: <i>SH</i> 368–95 H. Diels, <i>Poetarum philosophorum fragmenta</i> . Berlin 1901 M. Di Marco, <i>Timone di Fliunte: Silli</i> . Rome 1989
Vita Ap. Rhod.	<i>Vita Apollonii Rhodii: Sch. Ap. Rhod.</i> 1–2
Vita Arati	<i>Scholia in Aratum vetera</i> , ed. J. Martin. Stuttgart 1974 [BT]
Vita Eur.	<i>Vita Euripidis: Sch. Eur.</i> 1–6
Xenocrates	R. Heinze, <i>Xenocrates: Darstellung der Lehre und Sammlung der Fragmente</i> . Leipzig 1892 M. Isnardi Parente, <i>Senocrate, Ermodoro: Frammenti</i> . Naples 1982
Zeno Cit.	Zeno Citieus: <i>SVF</i> 1.3–72
Zeno El.	Zeno Eleatus: 29 DK 1.247–58
Zeno Tars.	Zeno Tarsensis: <i>SVF</i> 3.209
Zenob.	Zenobius vulgatus, vel potius <i>Zenobii epitomae proverbiorum Lucilli Tarrhaei et Didymi recensio vulgata: CPG</i> 1.1–175; cf. Bühler 91–124

C. Other abbreviations

a.	anno
add.	addidit, addiderunt
c.	circa
cett.	codices ceteri non ante adlati
cf.	confer
codd.	codices omnes qui indicantur
col.	columna/e (column/s)
coni.	coniecit, coniecerunt
cruc.	cruce, crucibus
del.	delevit, deleverunt
edd.	editores vel editiones nonnulli
F, fr.	fragmentum, fragmenta (fragment/s)
fl.	floruit
indic.	indicavit

Inscr.	inscriptio
lac.	lacuna/m
litt.	litterae, litterarum
n.	nota/e (note/s)
no.	numerus, numeri (number/s)
om.	omisit, omiserunt
p.	pagina/e (page/s)
praef.	praefatio
recc.	codicum recentiorum unus vel plures
s.	saeculum
secl.	seclisit, secluserunt
suppl.	supplevit, suppleverunt
susp.	suspexit, suspexerunt
s.v.	sub voce vel vocibus
T	testimonium, testimonia
t.	tomus
v.	volume
vid.	vide

D. Editorial signs

<α>	littera addenda vel supplenda
[α]	littera spuria et delenda
† ...	locus nondum sanatus
A	manus codicis A prima
A ²	manus codicis A posterior
<i>In papyro vel inscriptione</i>	
[α]	littera ab editore suppleta
{α}	littera ab editore deleta
[α]	littera a librario deleta
`α'	littera a librario supra scripta
α	littera mutila vel dubia
...	reliquiae totidem litterarum
[.]	littera deperdita
[— — —]	lacuna litterarum quarum numerus definiri nequit

I. VITA

De origine

1A Strabo, *Geographica* 14.2.13 655 (BT t. 3 p. 130.18-131.2 Kramer)

1 W ἄνδρες δ' ἐγένοντο μνήμης ἄξιοι πολλοὶ στρατηλάται
 τε καὶ ἀθληταί, ὧν εἰσι καὶ οἱ Παναιτίου τοῦ φιλοσόφου
 πρόγονοι· τῶν δὲ πολιτικῶν καὶ τῶν περὶ λόγους καὶ
 φιλοσοφίαν ὅ τε Παναίτιος αὐτὸς καὶ Στρατοκλῆς καὶ
 Ἀνδρόνικος ὁ ἐκ τῶν περιπάτων καὶ Λεωνίδης ὁ Στω- 5
 ικός, ἔτι δὲ πρότερον Πραξιφάνης καὶ Ἱερώνυμος καὶ
 Εὐδημος. Ποσειδώνιος δ' ἐπολιτεύσατο μὲν ἐν Ῥόδῳ καὶ
 ἐσοφίστευσεν, ἦν δ' Ἀπαμεὺς ἐκ τῆς Συρίας, καθάπερ
 καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ μαλακὸς καὶ Μόλων (ἦσαν γὰρ 10
 Ἀλαβανδεῖς, Μενεκλέους μαθηταὶ τοῦ ῥήτορος· ἐπεδή-
 μησε δὲ πρότερον Ἀπολλώνιος, ὃς δ' ἦκεν ὁ Μόλων,
 καὶ ἔφη πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνος “ὃς μολῶν” ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐλ-
 θῶν, καὶ Πείσανδρος δ' ὁ τὴν Ἡράκλειαν γράψας ποιη-
 τῆς Ῥόδιος, καὶ Σιμμίας ὁ γραμματικὸς καὶ Ἀριστοκλῆς 15
 ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς. Διονύσιος δὲ ὁ Θρᾷξ καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ
 τοὺς Ἀργοναύτας ποιήσας Ἀλεξανδρεῖς μὲν, ἐκαλοῦν-
 το δὲ Ῥόδιοι. περὶ μὲν Ῥόδου ἀποχρώντως εἴρηται.

1–7 Panaetius F 4 Alesse = F 3 van Straaten, Praxiphanes F 1 Wehrli,
 Eudemus F 2 Wehrli 4 Stratocles RE 2.4 (1931) 271 no. 8, cf.
 Dorandi (1994) 32–5 5 Andronicus DPhA 1 (1989) A 181 Le-
 onides RE 12 (1924) 2035 no. 3 7–8 Posidonius T 2a Edelstein-Kidd
 7–13 Molon 728 T 1a FGvH 9 Apollonius RE 2 (1896) 140 no. 84
 10 Menecles RE 15 (1932) 797 no. 3 13–14 Peisander T 1d Davies
 14 Simmias RE 2.3 (1929) 155 no. 6 Aristocles RE 2 (1896) 935 no.
 18 15 Dionysius Thrax RE 5 (1905) 977 no. 134 15–17 cf. Vita
 Ap. Rhod. 1 (1.12–2.2 Wendel), Vita 2 (2.7–11 Wendel), Suda α 3419

[CDEFGlsv] 4 φιλοσοφίαν Coraes: φιλοσοφίας codd. 5
 Στωικός CEFglsv: σοφιστής D recc. 9 καὶ Μόλων om. D recc.
 γὰρ: δὲ Meineke

I. LIFE

Origin

1A Strabo, *Geography* 14.2.13

There have been many men [of Rhodes] worthy of mention: both generals and athletes, including the ancestors of Panaetius the philosopher, and also statesmen, scholars, and philosophers, including Panaetius himself, Stratocles, Andronicus the Peripatetic, Leonides the Stoic, and still earlier Praxiphanes, Hieronymus, and Eudemus.¹ Posidonius was a citizen of Rhodes and taught there, though he was from Apameia in Syria; likewise Apollonius the Softy and Molon, who were from Alabanda and students of Menecles the rhetorician (Apollonius settled in Rhodes first and Molon came later, so Apollonius said to him “late Molon” instead of “late-comer”).² Also Peisander, the poet who wrote the *Heracleia*, was a Rhodian, and Simmias the scholar, and in our time Aristocles. Dionysius Thrax and the Apollonius who wrote the *Argonautica*, though Alexandrians, were called Rhodians. About Rhodes enough has been said.

From Strabo’s description of Rhodes (14.2.2–13), which covers the mainland Lycian “Peraea” (2–4), the city of Rhodes (5, 9), the island’s legendary origins (6–8, 10), the rest of the island (11–12), and finally some famous Rhodian teachers and writers. These are listed in five groups, each in mainly chronological order: four recent philosophers, three from the fourth and third centuries, three recent immigrants, three natives (two earlier poets and a first-century orator and scholar), and two earlier immigrants.

¹ Eudemus, who retired to Rhodes when Aristotle died in 322 BCE, probably started some sort of school not unlike the Lyceum; see H. Gottschalk, “Eudemus and the Peripatos,” in *Eudemus* (2002) 25–37, and E. Matelli in this volume.

² Molon, whose given name was Apollonius, was distinguished from his homonymous compatriot by this nickname (a poetic form of the participle “having come”); both were influential proponents of the “Asiatic” style in oratory.

1B Loci in hoc volumine alibi exscripti in quibus Rhodius nominatur Hieronymus

- 1 Anonymus (*POxy* 3656) = **55**
- 2 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.24 424F = **28**
- 3 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 11.101 499F = **29**
- 4 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.2 556B = **53B**
- 5 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.82 604D = **34**
- 6 Cicero, *De finibus* 2.8 = **18A**
- 7 Cicero, *Tusculanae disputationes* 2.15 = **20B**
- 8 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 1.26 = **47**
- 9 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 2.26 = **53A**
- 10 Plutarchus, *Aristides* 27.3 335C = **53C**

2 Tabula sepulcralis 2085 PM (t. 2.1 p. 500 Pfuhr et Möbius)

- * Ἱερωνύμου
τοῦ Σιμυλίνου Τλώϊου
[tabula, vid. p. 476]
Δαμάτριος ἐποίησε

Ed. pr. F. Hiller von Gaertringen et C. Robert, "Relief von dem Grabmal eines Rhodischen Schulmeisters," *Hermes* 37 (1902) 121–46. *Iterum tractaverunt* L. Curtius, "Zum sogenannten Relief eines Schulmeisters aus Rhodos und zum Unterwerksarkophag von Ephesos," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 4 (1951) 20–32; G. Arrighetti, "Ieronimo di Rodi," *Studi Classici ed Orientali* 3 (1954) 123–8; M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion* 2 (Munich 1961²) 234–5; P. M. Fraser, *Rhodian Funerary Monuments* (Oxford 1977) 34–6, 129–30; E. Pfuhr et H. Möbius, *Die Ostgriechischen Grabreliefs* 2.1 (Mainz 1979) 500–1 et 2.2 fig. 300; K. Gaiser, *Das Philosophenmosaik in Neapel: eine Darstellung der platonischen Akademie* (Heidelberg 1980) 15–17; A. Scholl, "Πολυτάλαντα μνημεῖα: zur literarischen und monumentalen Überlieferung aufwendiger Grabmäler im spätklassischen Athen," *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 109 (1994) 247–9.

1B Texts printed elsewhere in this volume in which Hieronymus is named as Rhodian

- 1 Anonymus (*POxy* 3656) = **55**
- 2 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 10.24 424F = **28**
- 3 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 11.101 499F = **29**
- 4 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 13.2 556B = **53B**
- 5 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 13.82 604D = **34**
- 6 Cicero, *On Ends* 2.8 = **18A**
- 7 Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 2.15 = **20B**
- 8 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.26 = **47**
- 9 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 2.26 = **53A**
- 10 Plutarch, *Aristides* 27.3 335C = **53C**

2 Epitaph from Rhodes (2085 Pfuhr and Möbius)

Hieronymos
son of Simylinos of Tlos
[Relief: see p. 476]
made by Damatrios

From a large marble epitaph with a complex figural relief reportedly found at Ialysos (modern Trianda) on Rhodes; probably from the latter half of the third century. Location, date, and iconography suit Hieronymus the Peripatetic, but the identification falls short of certainty; see Hiller-Robert 121–46, P. M. Fraser, *Rhodian Funeral Monuments* (1977) 34–6, 129–30, and E. Matelli and P. Scholz in this volume. Thirteen other Rhodians named Hieronymus are attested in inscriptions, including three others from Tlos, all from the third century (*LGPN* 1 s.v.). Cf. **58**.

The town of Tlos and its eponymous deme or district were part of the Rhodian Peraea (incorporated territory on the Carian mainland), probably at the site of Roman Gelos (modern Prinari) on the Loryma peninsula; see P. M. Fraser and G. E. Beane, *The Rhodian Peraea and Islands* (1954) 58–9. Citizens of Tlos (Tloioi) enjoyed full Rhodian citizenship. The name Simylinos is attested only six times, all Rhodians and all but one from the third century; one from Tlos (possibly a nephew of this Hieronymus) was a priest of Apollo for Kamiros c. 200 BC (*ILind* 674).

Athenis

3A Hesychius Milesius, “Vita Aristotelis” 9 (p. 82.18-21 Düring)

² W διάδοχοι δ' αὐτοῦ τῆς σχολῆς κατὰ τάξιν ἐγένοντο οἶδε· Θεόφραστος, Στράτων, Πραξιτέλης, Λύκων, Ἀρίστων, Λυκίσκος, Πραξιφάνης, Ἱερώνυμος, Πρύτανις, Φορμίων, Κριτόλαος.

= “Vita Aristotelis Menagiana” p. 402.20–3 Westermann = p. 10.19–22 Rose = p. 26a33–6 Gigon 1–4 Theophr. 11 no. 7 FHS&G, Strato F 3 Wehrli, Lyco 3B SFOD = F 6 Wehrli, Aristo Ceus 4A SFOD = F 7 Wehrli, Praxiphanes F 3 Wehrli, Critolaus F 3 Wehrli 2 Praxiteles: cf. D.L. 5.52 3 Prytanis RE 23.1 (1957) 1158 no. 5, cf. R. Kassel, ZPE 60 (1985) 23–4 4 Phormio RE 20.1 (1941) 540 no. 8

2 Πραξιτέλης : Πασικλῆς Preller delendum censuit Rose

3B Loci in hoc volumine alibi exscripti in quibus Hieronymus aut Peripateticus aut discipulus vel successor Aristotelis nominatur

- 1 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.24 424F = **28**
- 2 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.78 602A = **35**
- 3 Cicero, *Academici libri* 2.131 = **13A**
- 4 Cicero, *De finibus* 5.14 = **11**
- 5 Cicero, *Orator* 190 = **37A**
- 6 Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromateis* 2.21.127 = **12**
- 7 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 4.41 = **4**
- 8 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 5.67–8 = **6**
- 9 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 9.112 = **7**

cf. Plutarchus, *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* 13 1096A = **40**

4 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 4.40–2 (BT t. 1 p. 286.1–287.3 Marcovich)

πολυτελής δὲ ἄγαν ὦν (καὶ τί γὰρ ἄλλο ἢ ἕτερος Ἀρίστιππος) ἐπὶ τὰ δεῖπνα πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοιοτρόπους μὲν, πλὴν

In Athens

3A Hesychius of Miletus, “Life of Aristotle”

Successors in his school were in order the following: Theophrastus, Strato, Praxiteles, Lyco, Aristo, Lyciscus, Praxiphanes, Hieronymus, Prytanis, Phormio, Critolaos.

From an abbreviated “Life” in a biographical compendium based on the *Onomatologos* (“Biographical Dictionary”) of Hesychius (sixth century CE); a catalogue of Aristotle’s works follows. On this and other lists of Aristotle’s successors in the Lyceum, see K. Brink, *RE Suppl.* 7 (1940) 908–11. Hieronymus may be named as a teacher in his own right, either in Athens (cf. **5**) or on Rhodes (cf. **1** and Wehrli 29), or simply as a contemporary of Lyco (along with the three preceding him here); see E. Matelli in this volume.

3B Texts printed elsewhere in this volume in which Hieronymus is named as either a Peripatetic or Aristotle’s student or successor

- 1 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 10.24 424F = **28**
- 2 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 13.78 602A = **35**
- 3 Cicero, *Academics* 2.131 = **13A**
- 4 Cicero, *On Ends* 5.14 = **11**
- 5 Cicero, *Orator* 190 = **37A**
- 6 Clemens of Alexandria, *Miscellanies* 2.21.127 = **12**
- 7 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 4.41 = **4**
- 8 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 5.67–8 = **6**
- 9 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 9.112 = **7**

cf. Plutarch, *That Epicurus Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible* 13 1096A = **40**

4 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 4.40–2

Arcesilaus lived extremely lavishly, just like another Aristippus, and he went to dinners only if the host had similar tastes. He also

- ἀλλ' ἀπήντα. καὶ Θεοδότῃ τε καὶ Φίλῃ ταῖς Ἡλείαις
 ἐταίραις συνῶκει φανερώς, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς διασύροντας
 προεφέρετο τὰς Ἀριστίππου χρείας. φιλομειράκιός τε ἦν 5
 καὶ καταφερέας· ὅθεν οἱ περὶ Ἀρίστωνα τὸν Χῖον Στωι-
 κοὶ ἐπεκάλουν αὐτῷ, φθορέα τῶν νέων καὶ κιναιδολόγον
 41 καὶ θρασὺν ἀποκαλοῦντες. ... διὰ ταῦτα δὴ οὖν ἔδακνόν
 τε αὐτὸν οἱ προειρημένοι καὶ ἐπέσκωπτον ὡς φίλοχλον
 4W καὶ φιλόδοξον. μάλιστα δὲ ἐπετίθεντο αὐτῷ παρὰ Ἱερω- 10
 νύμῳ τῷ Περιπατητικῷ, ὁπότε συνάγοι τοὺς φίλους εἰς
 τὴν Ἀλκυονέως τοῦ Ἀντιγόνου υἱοῦ ἡμέραν, εἰς ἣν ἱκα-
 νὰ χρήματα ἀπέστελλεν ὁ Ἀντίγονος πρὸς ἀπόλαυσιν.
 42 ἔνθα καὶ παραιτούμενος ἐκάστοτε τὰς ἐπικυλικίους ἐξη-
 γήσεις, πρὸς Ἀρίδηλον προτείνοντά τι θεώρημα καὶ ἀξι- 15
 οῦντα εἰς αὐτὸ λέγειν εἶπεν, “ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο μάλιστα
 φιλοσοφίας ἴδιον, τὸ καιρὸν ἐκάστων ἐπίστασθαι.”

1–17 *Arcesilaus T 1a Mette* 1–5 *Aristipp. 4 A 99 SSR 2* 3–8
[Hesych.] Vir. illustr. 8 5–18 *Aristo Chius F 345 SVF 1* 15–17
[Hesych.] Vir. illustr. 8

[BPF, D] 1 δὲ *P*: τε *BF* 3 Φίλῃ ταῖς *Cobet*: φιλαίτη *B²PF*:
 φιλετη *B* ἡλείαις *FP²*: ἡλιδι *BP* 4 ἐταίραις *P*: ἐτέραις *F*:
 ἐταῖρα *B* 5 προεφέρετο *Hübner*: προσεφέρετο *codd.* 7 αὐτῷ *BP*:
 αὐτὸν *F* 10–11 παρὰ Ἱερωνύμῳ τῷ περιπατητικῷ *BPF*: οἱ περὶ
 ἱερώνυμον τὸν περιπατητικόν *D, edd.* 11 συνάγοι *PF*: συνάγει *B*
 13 ἀπέστελλεν *BP*: ἀπέστειλεν *F* ὁ *om. P* 15 ἀρίδηλον:
 Ἀριδείκην *Kuehn, fortasse recte; cf. Wilamowitz, Antigonos 75,*
Aridicas Rhodius DPhA 1 (1989) A 330 16 αὐτὸ *PF*: αὐτὸν *B*
 εἶπεν *Stephanus*: εἰπεῖν *codd.*

lived openly with Theodote and Phila, the courtesanes from Elis; and when people reproached him for this, he would recite anecdotes about Aristippus. He was also fond of adolescent boys and prone to temptation. For this the Stoic circle of Aristo of Chios denounced him, pronouncing him a corrupter of the young, a se-
 41 ducer, and brazen. ...³ For these reasons, then, Aristo's circle would tease him and make fun of him for trying to please the crowd and win popularity.⁴ They would assail him especially at the house of Hieronymus the Peripatetic⁵ whenever he brought his friends together⁶ for the anniversary of Halcyoneus the son of Antigonus,⁷
 42 which Antigonus would send funds to celebrate.⁸ There he [sc. Arcesilaus] always refused to join in the discussions after dinner;⁹ once when Aridelos¹⁰ proposed a question and asked him to address it, he replied, "But this very thing is a mark of philosophy: knowing the right time for each thing."

From Diogenes' "Life of Arcesilaus" (4.28–45); **5** follows immediately. Some of the information here probably comes from the *Life of Arcesilaus* by Antigonus of Carystus; but for reservations, see Dorandi lix–lxiii. The gatherings which Hieronymus hosted (annually according to **6**; note the imperfect tenses here) were sponsored by Antigonus II Gonatas (c. 319–239), who especially admired the Stoic Zeno (D.L. 7.6–15); see **57A–B** for possible correspondence from Antigonus to Hieronymus. The gatherings probably occurred after the Chremonidean War (268–263/2), when Antigonus controlled Athens, Zeno had died (262/1), Arcesilaus was head of the Academy (268/4–241/0; cf. **5**), Lyco led the Lyceum (270/68–226/4; cf. **6**), and Timon had settled in Athens (cf. **7**); for dates, see T. Dorandi in *Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy* (1999) 31–54. Festivities supporting Antigonus would be impossible during the war, which was against Antigonus; and Lyco's hostility (**6**), which suggests he was already scholar, makes the years before the war unlikely; but see E. Matelli in this volume.

¹ Two sentences omitted here recount anecdotes about Arcesilaus and two of his favorite boyfriends.

² Cf. **7** for similar criticism from the Pyrrhonist Timon; both he and Aristo compared Arcesilaus to Pyrrho (D.L. 4.33).

³ The primary manuscripts have "at the house of Hieronymus" the text adopted by most editors, which has "the circle of Hieronymus" assailing Arcesilaus, is probably a scribal conjecture; see T. Dorandi, *Prometheus* 28 (2002) 52–6. The site was probably not the Lyceum, since Lyco refused to attend (**6**); for banquets held there under Lyco, see Lyco **8**.

⁴ The subject of the verb is probably Hieronymus (see LSJ s.v. συνάγω I.2), which implies that he considered both Arcesilaus (cf. **5**) and Aristo his friends; alternatively, Arcesilaus brought his own friend along with him.

⁵ The "anniversary" (literally "day" but an annual even; see **6**) was probably a ceremonial banquet honoring the memory of Halcyoneus, who died in

5 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 4.42 (BT t. 1 p. 287.3–14 Marcovich)

εἰς δὲ τὸ διαβαλλόμενον αὐτοῦ φίλοχλον καὶ Τίμων
τά τε ἄλλα φησίν, ἀτὰρ δὴ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον,
ὥς εἰπὼν ὄχλοιο περίστασιν εἰσκατέδυνεν.
οἱ δέ μιν ἤντε γλαῦκα πέρι σπίζαι τερατοῦντο
ἠλέματον δεικνύντες, ὁθούνεκεν ὄχλοάρεσκος. 5
οὐ μέγα πρῆγμα, τάλας· τί πλατύνει ἠλίθιος ὥς;
6W οὐ μὴν ἄλλ' οὕτως ἄτυφος ἦν ὥστε τοῖς μαθηταῖς παρ-
ῆναι καὶ ἄλλων ἀκούειν. καὶ τινος Χίου νεανίσκου μὴ
εὐαρεστομένου τῇ διατριβῇ αὐτοῦ ἄλλ' Ἰερωνύμου
τοῦ προειρημένου, αὐτὸς ἀπαγαγὼν συνέστησε τῷ 10
φιλοσόφῳ, παραινέσας εὐτακτεῖν.

1–11 Arcesilaus *T 1a Mette* 1–8 [*Hesych.*] *Vir. illustr.* 8 3–6 Timo
SH 808 = F 34 Diels 6 πλατύνει· cf. *Timo SH 794.1 = F 65 Diels*,
SH 809 = F 35 Diels

[*BPF, D, Φ*] 2 *post* δὴ *add.* καὶ *Cobet* 4 πέρι σπίζαι *Casaubon*·
περισπίζα *codd.* 5 ὄχλοάρεσκος *D*· ὄχλοαρέσκης *P*· ὄχλω
ἀρέσκες *BF* 6 πλατύνει *P*· πλατύνεται *F*· πλατύνει· αι *B* 9
εὐαρεστομένου *BPF*· ἀρεσκομένου *Φ*

battle, probably in the 260s; on Halcyoneus (tutored by Zeno's colleague Persaeus, D.L. 7.36; cf. **57A**), see Tarn, *Antigonos* 247–8, 272–4, 301, 335–6. For memorial banquets among Epicureans, see D. Clay, “The Cults of Epicurus,” *CrE* 16 (1986) 11–28; for parallels in the Academy, see S. White, “Socrates at Colonus,” in *Reason and Religion in Socratic Philosophy*, ed. N. Smith and P. Woodruff (2000) 151–75.

⁶ Antigonus also sent funds to Cleanthes (D.L. 7.169; half a talent), with whom he had studied. His support of Hieronymus suggests that either he or his son Halcyoneus had studied with him.

⁷ Literally “explanations over drinks,” which could include philosophical questions (cf. *θεωρημα* in 4.16) as well as “problems” in science and cultural history such as Hieronymus may have included in a sympotic dialogue (cf. **9, 41**) and his work *On Drunkenness* (cf. **28–9**).

⁸ Aridelos is otherwise unknown; the name is attested (*LPGN* 1 s.v.) but not on Rhodes. As Wilamowitz, *Antigonos* 75 observed, it is probably an error (by D.L., his source, or a scribe) for Arideices, a student of Arcesilaus (Philod. *Acad. hist.* 20.7–8; cf. Ath. 10 420D and Plut. *QC* 2.1 634C for more sympotic anecdotes), who is eulogized as a Platonist in an epitaph found on Rhodes (*GVI* 1451) and may also have served as a Rhodian diplomat c. 220 (Polyb. 4.52.2); see *DPhA* 1 (1989) A 330.

5 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 4.42

Regarding the charge that he [sc. Arcesilaus] sought popular approval, Timon as well says many things like the following:

So saying, he slipped off into the crowd standing round.

The others gesticulated madly, like finches round an owl,
pointing out his conceit because he was a crowd-pleaser.

No big deal, wretch: why do you pontificate¹ like an idiot?²

Yet Arcesilaus was so unpretentious that he encouraged his students to study with others as well. When a young man from Chios was dissatisfied with his teaching and preferred the Hieronymus mentioned above, Arcesilaus himself took him over to introduce him to the philosopher and admonished him to behave himself.³

From Diogenes' “Life of Arcesilaus,” immediately following **4**; Antigonus of Carystus is again only a likely source. Arcesilaus had studied under Theophrastus (4.22 and 29–30, cf. 18 no. 2 *FHS&G*), and his respect for Hieronymus contrasts sharply with his disdain for Epicureans; in an anecdote that follows immediately, Arcesilaus explains why some philosophy students transferred to the Epicureans but none did the reverse: “men can become eunuchs [literally “Galloi”: initiates in the rites of Cybele] but eunuchs do not become men” (4.43).

¹ Timon's verb is a pun which sounds like “platonicate” but means “dilate, expatiate” (cf. *SH* 794, 809).

- 6** Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 5.67–8 (BT t. 1 p. 356.9–14 Marcovich)

ὥς οὐκ ἄλλος τε ἦν φίλος τοῖς περὶ Εὐμένη καὶ Ἀττα-
 λον, οἱ καὶ πλείστα ἐπεχορήγουν αὐτῷ. ἐπειράθη δ' αὐ-
 3W 68 τὸν σχεῖν καὶ Ἀντίοχος, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔτυχεν. οὕτω δὲ ἦν
 ἐχθρὸς Ἱερωνύμῳ τῷ Περιπατητικῷ ὥς μόνον μὴ ἀπαν-
 τᾶν πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ἐτήσιον ἡμέραν, περὶ ἧς ἐν τῷ 5
 περὶ Ἀρκεσιλάου βίῳ διειλέγμεθα.

1–6 *Lyco* 1.34–40 *SFOD* 1–3 *Lyco* F 11 *Wehrli* 3–6 *Lyco* F 10
Wehrli 5–6 cf. *D.L.* 4.41 = 4.11–14

[BPF] 4 μόνον: μόνος *Cobet*

Dicta

- 7** Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 9.112 (BT t. 1 p. 706.3–8 Marcovich)

ὁ δ' οὖν φιλόσοφος καὶ φιλόκηπος ἦν σφόδρα καὶ ἰδιο-
 7W πράγμων, ὥς καὶ Ἀντίγονός φησι. λόγος γοῦν εἰπεῖν
 Ἱερώνυμον τὸν Περιπατητικὸν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, “ὥς παρὰ τοῖς

² Cf. 4.37 for Arcesilaus' popularity as a teacher. He was a favorite target of the Pyrrhonist Timon (cf. *SH* 805–7, 829, and 4 n. 2), who nonetheless eulogized him after his death (D.L. 9.115).

³ A Chian student named Hemon appears in another anecdote involving Arcesilaus in 4.34. R. Bett, "Reactions to Aristotle in the Greek Sceptical Traditions," *Methexis* 12 (1999) 17–34, suggests (21) that the student was supposed to return with more doctrines for Arcesilaus to rebut.

6 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 5.67–8

Lyco was on extremely good terms with Eumenes and Attalus and their court, and they gave him major financial support.¹ 68 Antiochus also tried to get Lyco's support but had no luck.² But he [sc. Lyco] was so hostile toward Hieronymus the Peripatetic that he alone avoided him on the annual day [for Halcyoneus], which I have described in my "Life of Arcesilaus."³

From Diogenes' "Life of Lyco"; the source is probably either Antigonus of Carystus, who wrote a *Life of Lyco* (see Dorandi lxiii–vi), or Aristo of Ceos, Lyco's colleague and successor. The sequence of thought here suggests a political basis for Lyco's hostility: he enjoyed the favor of the Attalids and a Seleucid but avoided an event sponsored by Antigonus and hosted by a friend of his; cf. Arrighetti 116–20, and E. Matelli in this volume. Yet Arcesilaus, who also had good relations with the Attalids but avoided Antigonus (D.L. 4.38–9), did attend the banquet; and the basis for Lyco's dislike of Hieronymus may rather have been personal or intellectual.

¹ Eumenes I of Pergamum (263–41) and his successor Attalus I Soter (241–197); cf. Lyco 1 n. 6.

² Probably Antiochus II Theos (c. 287–246) rather than Antiochus I Soter (324–261); cf. Lyco 1 n. 7. As an enemy, then rival of the Attalids, Antiochus failed in his overtures to Lyco; cf. Narcy in *Diogène* (1999) 628 n. 3.

³ Cf. 4; Lyco apparently avoided "meeting Hieronymus face to face" (ἀπαντᾶν πρὸς αὐτὸν) by not going to his house for the banquet.

Sayings

7 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 9.112

Timon the philosopher was very fond of the garden and independent,¹ as Antigonus as well says. At any rate, the story is that Hieronymus the Peripatetic said of him, "As the Scythians use their

Σκύθαις καὶ οἱ φεύγοντες τοξεύουσι καὶ οἱ διώκοντες,
 οὕτω τῶν φιλοσόφων οἱ μὲν διώκοντες θηρῶσι τοὺς 5
 μαθητάς, οἱ δὲ φεύγοντες, καθάπερ καὶ ὁ Τίμων.”

1–2 *Antig. Caryst. F 7 Dorandi, cf. Timo B I Diels = F I Di Marco*

[BPF, Φ] 5 θηρῶσι BPF: αἰροῦσι Φ

II. SCRIPTA

De libris

8A Tabula inscriptionum

- 1a Περὶ ἐποχῆς] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae* 2.105 = **54**
- b Περὶ συνοχῆς] Anonymus, *POxy* 3656 = **55**
- 2 Περὶ μέθης] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10 424F = **28**, 11 500A = **29**
- 3a Περὶ ποιητῶν] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14 635F = **41**
- b Περὶ κιθαρῳδῶν] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14 635F (ὅπερ ἐστὶ πέμπτον Περὶ ποιητῶν) = **41**
- c Περὶ τραγωδιοποιῶν] *Suda* s.v. Ἀναγυράσιος (α 1842 1.165.26 Adler) = **42A**; *Suda* s.v. ἐγκατω-
 κოდόμησεν (ε 78 2.193.11 Adler), Photius *Lexicon* s.v.
 Ἀναγυράσιος δαίμων (α 1432 149.12 Theodoridis),
 Apostolius *Proverbia* 9.79 (*CPG* 2 479.12)
- 4 Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophis-
 tae* 13 557E = **33**, 13 604D = **34**
- 5 Σποράδην ὑπομνήματα] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae*
 1.26 (ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ) = **47**, 2.14 (ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ) = **49**

bows both in retreat and in pursuit, so some philosophers hunt for students by pursuing, others by retreating, just as Timon does.”²

From Diogenes’ “Life of Timon.” The first sentence comes from the *Life of Timon* by Antigonus of Carystus (see Dorandi lii–iii); the second sentence, cited here to illustrate the first, may or may not have the same origin. The point of the analogy seems to be that Timon’s Pyrrhonian arguments and satirical verses (his “arrows”), which criticized others but maintained no position of his own, still attracted a following.

¹ The hapax φιλόκηπος (“fond of the garden”), like ιδιοπράγμων (“independent”), probably denotes avoidance of public life (“garden” like the modern “ivory tower”); cf. the opening line of Timon’s *Epilogue* (*SH* 775 = *F* 1 Diels, also quoted in 9.112), and Dorandi 47 n. 34–5.

² The Scythians were nomadic horsemen and proverbial for fighting on the run instead of standing their ground. Cf. 29 n.

II. WRITINGS

Books

8A List of titles

- 1a *On Suspension*] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 2.105 = **54**
- b *On Cohesion*] Anonymous, *POxy* 3656 = **55**
- 2 *On Drunkenness*] Athenaeus, *Sophists* 10.24 424E–F = **28**;
11.101 499E–500B = **29**
- 3a *On Poets*] Athenaeus, *Sophists* 14.37 635E–F = **41**
- b *On Citharodes* = *On Poets* Book 5] Athenaeus, *Sophists*
14.37 635E–F = **41**
- c *On Tragedians*] *Suda* s.v. Anagyrasian = **42A**; Photius, *Lexicon* s.v. Anagyrasian spirit; *Suda* s.v. entomb; Apostolius, *Proverbs* 9.79
- 4 *Historical Notes*] Athenaeus, *Sophists* 13.5 557E = **33**;
13.81–2 603E–4F = **34**
- 5 *Miscellaneous Notes*] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 1.26 = **47**;
2.13–14 = **49**

Vid. Hiller 88: “his titulis [sc. no. 4 et 5] unum idem-que opus significari coniectura est haud improbabilis illa quidem, minime tamen certa;” cf. Arist. F 631–6 Rose, Aristox. F 129–32, 139 Wehrli, Theophr. 589 no. 8, 727 no. 6–7 FHS&G.

- 6 Ἡλιακά] Timachidas, *Tabula de prodigiis* 1 = **60A**, *Tabula de donis votivis* 32 = **60B**
- 7 Ἐπιστολαί] Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10 435A = **30**
- 8 Περὶ τέλους vel τελῶν (?)] cf. **11–23**
- 9 Περὶ ὀργῆς vel ἀοργησίας (?)] cf. **25–7**
- 10 Περὶ παίδων ἀγωγῆς vel Περὶ παιδείας (?)] cf. **31–2**
- 11 Περὶ Ἰσοκράτους (?)] cf. **37A–39**

8B Iudicia de libris Hieronymi

- 1 Cicero, *De finibus* 5.14 = **11**: doctum hominem et suavem
- 2 Cicero, *Orator* 190 = **37A**: Peripateticus in primis nobilis (sed cf. **11**: quem cur iam Peripateticum appellem nescio)
- 3 Plutarch, *De cohibenda ira* 4 454F = **25**: χρήσιμα λέγων καὶ παραινῶν, sed οὐκ ἤρεσκεν οὖν μοι . . . ἐν οἷς οὗ φησι . . .
- 4 Strabo, *Geographica* 14.2.13 655 = **1A**: Rhodii μνήμης ἄξιοι

cf. Zeno Tarsensis (F 2 SVF 3) apud Philodemi *Stoicorum historiam* (*PHerc.* 1018 col. 48.1–2) = **24**: πέντε Πρὸς Ἱερώνυμον

Symposium vel symposiastica

- 9 Plutarchus, *Quaestiones convivales* 1 praef. 612D–E (BT t. 4 p. 2.4–19 Hubert)

25 w ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ σοὶ δοκεῖ τῶν μὲν ἀτόπων ἢ λήθη τῷ ὄντι σοφῇ κατ' Εὐριπίδην εἶναι, τὸ δ' ὅλως ἀμνημονεῖν τῶν

See Hiller 88: “That these titles [sc. no. 4 and 5] refer to one and the same work is a conjecture hardly unlikely but far from certain”; cf. Arist. F 631–6 Rose, Aristox. F 129–32, 139 Wehrli, Theophr. 589 no. 8, 727 no. 6–7 FHS&G.

- 6 *Heliaca*] Timachidas, *Table of Manifestations* 1 = **60A**; *Table of Votives* 32 = **60B**
- 7 *Letters*] Athenaeus, *Sophists* 10.45 434F–5A = **30**
- 8 *On the End* or *On Ends* (?)] cf. **11–23**
- 9 *On Anger* or *On Controlling Anger* (?)] cf. **25–7**
- 10 *On Raising Children* or *On Education* (?)] cf. **31–2**
- 11 *On Isocrates* (?)] cf. **37A–39**

8B Judgments of Hieronymus’ works

- 1 Cicero, *On Ends* 5.14 = **11** : “learned and elegant”
- 2 Cicero, *Orator* 190 = **37A** : “among the most notable Peripatetics” (but cf. **11** : “Now why I should call him a Peripatetic I do not know”)
- 3 Plutarch, *On Controlling Anger* 4 454F = **25** : “other useful remarks and advice” but “I do not agree . . . when he says . . .”
- 4 Strabo, *Geographica* 14.2.13 655 = **1A** : Rhodians “worthy of mention”

cf. Zeno of Tarsis (F 2 SVF 3) in Philodemus, *History of Stoics* (Herculaneum Papyrus 1018 col. 48) = **24**: “five volumes *Against Hieronymus*”

Symposium or Table Talk

9 Plutarch, *Table Talk* 1 Preface 612D–E

Since you too agree with Euripides that forgetting strange things is in fact wise, whereas not remembering anything after

ἐν οἴνῳ μὴ μόνον τῷ φιλοποιῷ λεγομένῳ μάχεσθαι τῆς
 τραπέζης, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων τοὺς ἐλλογιμωτά- 5
 τους ἀντιμαρτυροῦντας ἔχειν, Πλάτωνα καὶ Ξενοφῶντα
 καὶ Ἀριστοτέλην καὶ Σπεύσιππον, Ἐπίκουρόν τε καὶ
 Πρῦτανιν καὶ Ἱερώνυμον καὶ Δίωνα τὸν ἐξ Ἀκαδημίας,
 ὡς ἄξιόν τινος σπουδῆς πεπονημένους ἔργον ἀναγράψ-
 ασθαι λόγους παρὰ πότον γενομένους, φήθης τε δεῖν 10
 ἡμᾶς τῶν σποράδην πολλάκις ἐν τε Ῥώμῃ μεθ' ὑμῶν καὶ
 παρ' ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι παρούσης ἅμα τραπέζης καὶ
 κύλικος φιλολογηθέντων συναγαγεῖν τὰ ἐπιτήδεια, πρὸς
 τοῦτο γενόμενος τρία μὲν ἤδη σοι πέπομφα τῶν βιβλίων,
 ἐκάστου δέκα προβλήματα περιέχοντος, πέμψω δὲ καὶ
 τὰ λοιπὰ ταχέως, ἂν ταῦτα δόξῃ μὴ παντελῶς ἄμουσα 15
 μηδ' ἀπροσδιόνυσ' εἶναι.

1–16 *Speusippus T 46 Tarán* 1–2 *Eur. Orestes 213* (κακῶν *pro*
 ἀτόπων) 6 *Arist. Συμπόσιον vel* *Περὶ μέθης F 99–101 Rose*
Epicurus p. 115.3–6 Usener, cf. Συμπόσιον D.L. 10.28, F 57–65 Usener
7 Prytanis RE 23.1 (1957) 1158 no. 5 Dio Alex-andrinus DPhA 2
(1994) D 162 10 σποράδην: *cf. QC 2 praef. 629D, 8 no. 6*

[*T = Vindobonensis 148, s. xi*] 10 ἐν τε Ῥώμῃ *Amyot*: ἐν ἐτέρῳ
 μὴ *T*

PHYSICA

De visu

- 10 Plutarchus, *Quaestiones convivales* 1.8 626A–B (BT t. 4 p. 34.9–35.2 Hubert)

53 W Λαμπρίας δ' ὁ ἀδελφὸς τὴν Ἱερωνύμου < > οὐκ
 ἀνέγνωκεν < > εὐφυΐαν ἐμπεσῶν < .. > ὅτι τοῖς προσ-
 πίπτουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρατῶν <σώμα>σιν πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν
 ὁρῶμεν, ἃ πρῶτον μὲν ἀπέρχεται μεγάλα καὶ παχυμερῇ,

wine conflicts not only with the friendly nature of dining, but also with the contrary testimony of the most celebrated philosophers, Plato, Xenophon, Aristotle, and Speusippus, and Epicurus, Prytanis, Hieronymus, and Dio the Academic, who all considered it a very worthwhile task to record conversations over drinks, you suggested we should collect the suitable material from our frequent discussions of miscellaneous scholarly topics over food and drink both with you and your friends in Rome and at our own home in Greece.¹ To this end I have already sent you three of these volumes, each containing ten problems, and I shall soon send the rest, if you find these not utterly alien to the Muses or Dionysus.²

From Plutarch's introduction to his collection of short sympotic dialogues. After dedicating the work to Quintus Sosius Senecio (consul 99, 107), he cites some distinguished antecedents; only Plato's and Xenophon's survive, but Plutarch implies that the rest were dialogues too. Aristotle's *Symposium* (if the same as his *On Drunkenness*, F 100–11 Rose, including F 108 from *QC* 3.3; see Moraux 33 n. 33) apparently focused on drinking customs, as did Theophrastus' *On Drunkenness* (F 569–79 FHS&G); but Aristoxenus' *Assorted Sympotica* (F 122–7 Wehrli) also covered literary history and education. Hieronymus discussed drinking in *On Drunkenness* (28–9, cf. 30), but perhaps also other topics as well (cf. 10 from *QC* 1.8, 40, 4 n. 7).

¹ These “discussions of miscellaneous scholarly topics” (σποράδην φιλολογηθέντα) may parallel Hieronymus' *Miscellaneous Notes* (8A no. 6); cf. Plutarch's introduction to Book 2: σποράδην δ' ἀναγέγραπται καὶ οὐ διακεκριμένως ἀλλ' ὥς ἕκαστον εἰς μνήμην ἦλθεν (629D).

² The Muses represent learned conversation, Dionysus the wine to promote it.

NATURAL SCIENCE

On vision

10 Plutarch, *Table Talk* 1.8 626A–B

My <brother> Lamprias had not read Hieronymus' <...> natural ability <...> had begun <...>¹ that we see by means of the bodies coming from visible objects that encounter our vision. These bodies are large and dense when they first depart, which is why they disturb the elderly when they are close, since their eyesight is

διὸ τοὺς γέροντας ἐγγύθεν ἐπιταράττει βραδυπόρον καὶ 5
 σκληρὰν ἔχοντας τὴν ὄρασιν· ἀνενεχθέντων δ' εἰς τὸν
 B ἄερα καὶ λαβόντων διάστημα, τὰ μὲν γεώδη περιθραύ-
 εται καὶ ἀποπίπτει, τὰ δὲ λεπτὰ προσπελάζοντα ταῖς
 ὤψεσιν ἀλύπως καὶ ὁμαλῶς ἐναρμόττει τοῖς πόροις, ὥσθ' 10
 ἦττον ταραττομένους μᾶλλον ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι. καὶ γὰρ
 αἱ τῶν ἀνθῶν ὅσμαι πόρρωθεν εὐωδέστεραι προσπίπτου-
 σιν, ἂν δ' ἐγγύθεν ἄγαν προσάγῃς, οὐχ οὕτω καθαρὸν
 οὐδ' ἄκρατον ὀδώδασιν· αἴτιον δ' ὅτι πολλὰ τῶν γεω-
 δῶν καὶ θολερῶν συναποφέρεται τῇ ὁσμῇ καὶ διαφθείρει 15
 τὴν εὐωδίαν ἐγγύθεν λαμβανομένης, ἂν δ' ἄπωθεν, τὰ
 μὲν θολερὰ καὶ γεώδη περιρρεῖ καὶ ὑποπίπτει, τὸ δ' εἰλι-
 κρινὲς καὶ θερμὸν αὐτῆς ὑπὸ λεπτότητος διασφύζεται
 C πρὸς τὴν αἴσθησιν.

2–10 [Arist.] *Probl.* 31.14, [Alex.] *Probl.* 1.74; cf. [Arist.] *Probl.* 31.25
 11–18 *Theophr.* *CP* 6.17.1, [Arist.] *Probl.* 12.2, 12.9, *Probl.* *Ined.*
 2.102; cf. *Probl.* 12.1, 12.4, [Alex.] *Probl.* 2.64

1 δ' ὁ : δὲ Pohlenz ἀδελφὸς suppl. Stephanus: lac. 5–6 litt. T :
 ἀδελφὸς εἰς conī. Paton, προήνεγκε Pohlenz τὴν : τὸ Teodorsson
 lac. 4–5 litt. : δόξαν conī. Pohlenz, καίπερ Paton, βιβλίον Teodorsson
 2 ἀνέγνωκεν : ἀνεγνωκῶς Paton, Pohlenz lac. 4–5 litt. : ἐν(νοίαν
 δι') conī. Paton, μὲν (αὐτὸς δὲ δι') Pohlenz lac. 1–2 litt. : εἶπεν conī.
 Paton, εἰς τὴν ἐκείνου δόξαν εἶπεν Teodorsson : del. Pohlenz 3
 σώμασιν suppl. Lautner : lac. 2–3 litt. T : εἶδεν Stephanus 4
 ὁρώμεν, ἃ Stephanus : ὁρώμενα T 6 ἀνενεχθέντων Xylander :
 ἀνεχθέντων T : ἀναχθέντων Hubert 15 λαμβανομένης (sc. ὁσμῆς)
 Hubert : λαμβανομένην (sc. εὐωδίαν) T ἄπωθεν, τὰ Stephanus :
 ἀπὸ T 16 ὑποπίπτει : ἀποπίπτει Teodorsson 17 αὐτῆς (sc.
 ὁσμῆς) Hubert : αὐτοῦ T : αὐτῶν (sc. ἀνθῶν) Benseler : del. Pohlenz

ETHICA

De vita beata

Cum librum vel etiam libros de moribus conscripsisse Hieronymum prope certum sit, inscriptio nulla traditur; si vero testibus fidere licet, librum unum inscriptum esse verisimile est aut De vita beata (Περὶ εὐδαιμονίας), ut de libris Heraclidis (F 44 Wehrli), Xenocratis (D.L. 4.12), Theophrasti (436 no. 12 FHS&G; cf. Περὶ τῆς θείας

tough and not very porous. But after the bodies are released into the
 B air and travel some distance, the earthy particles get worn away
 and fall off, whereas the fine ones, when they reach their vision, fit
 their pores evenly and painlessly; so they are disturbed less and
 perceive better. Likewise, the scents of flowers are more fragrant
 when they strike us at a distance; but if you get too close to them,
 their smell is not as pure or undiluted. The cause is that many
 earthy and muddy particles are emitted with the scent, and these
 ruin its fragrance when it is received from nearby; but if received
 from a distance, the muddy and earthy particles flow away and sink
 down, while its purity and heat is preserved by its fineness until it
 C reaches our sense.

From a discussion of presbyopia: “Why do the elderly read better at a distance?”
 This is the third explanation canvassed; Plutarch concludes by proposing (in his
 own voice) a fourth based on Plato’s *Timaeus*. The corpuscular theory of vision
 here described has Peripatetic antecedents; see Ganson and Lautner in this volume.
 That is probably why it is proposed by Plutarch’s brother Lamprias, who admired
 the Lyceum (*QC* 2.2 635A–B; in 635C he cites ps.-Arist. *Problemata inedita* 2.27
 Bussemaker, cf. *QC* 6.8 and the ps.-Arist. *Problemata* 8.9); cf. S.-T. Teodorsson,
A Commentary on Plutarch’s Table Talks v. 1 (1989) 138. The initial lacunae here
 and the possibility that the theory figured in a dialogue by Hieronymus (cf. **9** and
30 n. 2) make it uncertain whether he endorsed the theory.

¹ The lacunae in the manuscripts, though short, may have contained significant
 details; compelling supplements are wanting.

ETHICS

The good life

Although it is virtually certain that Hieronymus wrote one or more
 books on ethics, no title is attested. But if the extant testimony may
 be trusted, it is likely that one of his works was entitled either *On*
Happiness, which is attested for works by Heraclides (F 44
 Wehrli), Xenocrates (D.L. 4.12), Theophrastus (436 no. 12
 FHS&G; cf. *On Divine Happiness, Against those from the Acad-*

εὐδαιμονίας πρὸς τοὺς ἐξ Ἀκαδημίας = 436 no. 13 FHS&G), Stratonis (F 134–5 Wehrli) traditur, aut De fine seu finibus (Περὶ τέλους vel τελῶν), ut de libris Epicuri (D.L. 10.27, F 66–71 Usener), Cleanthis (D.L. 7.175), Chrysippi (D.L. 7.85, cf. SVF 3 p. 204) inter alios traditur.

11 Cicero, *De finibus* 5.13–14 (OCT p. 177.20–178.13 Reynolds)

13 simus igitur contenti his. namque horum posteri meli-
ores illi quidem mea sententia quam reliquarum philo-
sophi disciplinarum, sed ita degenerant ut ipsi ex se nati
esse videantur. primum Theophrasti Strato physicum se
voluit, in quo etsi est magnus, tamen nova pleraque et per- 5
pauca de moribus. huius Lyco oratione locuples, rebus ipsis
ieiunior. concinnus deinde et elegans huius Aristo, sed ea
quae desiderata a magno philosopho gravitas in eo non fuit;
scripta sane et multa et polita, sed nescio quo pacto auctor-
8cW 14 itatem oratio non habet. praetereo multos, in his doctum 10
hominem et suavem, Hieronymum, quem iam cur Peripa-
teticum appellem nescio. summum enim bonum exposuit
vacuitatem doloris; qui autem de summo bono dissentit de
tota philosophiae ratione dissentit. Critolaus imitari voluit
antiquos, et quidem est gravitate proximus, et redundat 15
oratio, ac tamen <ne> is quidem in patriis institutis manet.
Diodorus eius auditor adiungit ad honestatem vacuitatem
doloris; hic quoque suus est, de summoque bono dissen-
tiens dici vere Peripateticus non potest.

1–19 Arist. *T 76b Düring*, *Antiochus F 9 Mette* 1–10 Lyco *II SFOD*
= *F 17 Wehrli*, *Aristo Ceus 8 SFOD* = *F 10 Wehrli* 1–7 Strato *F 12*
Wehrli 4 *Theophr. 18 no. 19 FHS&G* 14–16 *Critolaus F 11*
Wehrli 17–19 *Diodorus F4c Wehrli*, cf. *DPhA 2 (1994) D 132*

[*MOS, RP, BE*] 6 de *P*: *om. cett.* 16 ne *add. Bremius* 18 *suus*
PBE: *suus R*: *finis MOS*

emy = 436 no. 13 FHS&G), and Strato (F Wehrli), or *On the End* or *On Ends*, which is attested for works by Epicurus (D.L. 10.27, F 66-71 Usener), Cleanthes (D.L. 7.175), and Chrysippus (D.L. 7.85, cf. *SVF* 3 p. 204) among others.

11 Cicero, *On Ends* 5.13–14

- 13 “We may therefore be satisfied with these two [sc. Aristotle and Theophrastus]. For their successors, though certainly superior in my view to philosophers from other schools, are so inferior that they seem to be self-taught. First, after Theophrastus came Strato, who focused on natural science; and though he is a major scientist, most of his views are novel and very few are on ethics. After him came Lyco, who writes fluently but lacks substance. Next came Aristo, a careful and stylish writer, but lacking the seriousness of a major philosopher; his many works are certainly polished, but his
14 writing somehow lacks authority. Many I pass over, including the learned and elegant Hieronymus. Now why I should call him a Peripatetic I do not know, since he identified the greatest good with absence of pain, and whoever disagrees about the greatest good disagrees about the whole philosophical system.¹ Critolaus sought to emulate the ancients, and indeed he comes very close in authority, and his style is fluent. Yet not even he sticks to the original doctrines.² Diodorus, his student, combines absence of pain with virtue. He too is on his own, and since he disagrees about the greatest good, he cannot truly be called a Peripatetic.”³

From an exposition of Peripatetic ethics by Marcus Pupius Piso (c. 115–c. 55, consul 61); he prefaces his account by first praising the range of Aristotle and Theophrastus (9–12), then listing some of their successors (13–14). Along with most of his exposition, this picture of decline in the Hellenistic Lyceum derives from Antiochus of Ascalon, whose lectures Cicero and Piso attended in Athens in 79 BCE; see J. Annas 180–7, S. White (2002). On the view here ascribed to Hieronymus, see S. White in this volume.

¹ The central issue in Hellenistic ethics was the nature of eudaimonia or the good life, construed as the human telos or “end”; for man, including Antiochus, the question was decisive for school allegiance.

² Translating the emended text; the mss. give “but even he sticks to his teachers’ doctrines.” On Critolaus’ position, see Annas 413–15, White (2002) 84–91.

³ Diodorus’ position closely resembles Hieronymus’ and elicits the same objection; cf. Dalfino 288–9.

- 12** Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromateis* 2.21.127 (GCS t. 2 p. 181.28–182.14 Stählin-Früchtel-Treu)

- 127 Ἐπίκουρος δὲ ἐν τῷ μὴ πεινῆν μηδὲ διψῆν μηδὲ ῥιγοῦν
τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν τιθέμενος τὴν ἰσόθεον, ἐπεφώνησε φω-
νὴν ἀσεβῶς εἰπὼν ἐν τούτοις καὶ Διὶ πατρὶ μάχεσθαι,
ὥσπερ ὑῶν σκατοφάγων καὶ οὐχὶ τῶν λογικῶν καὶ φιλο- 5
σόφων τὴν μακαρίαν νίκην δογματίζων. τῶν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς
ἡδονῆς ἀρχομένων τούτους τε Κυρηναϊκοὺς εἶναι καὶ τὸν
2 Ἐπίκουρον· τούτους γὰρ τέλος εἶναι λέγειν διαρρήδην
τὸ ἡδέως ζῆν, τέλειον δὲ ἀγαθὸν μόνον τὴν ἡδονήν. ὁ δὲ
Ἐπίκουρος καὶ τὴν τῆς ἀλγηδόνης ὑπεξαιρέσιν ἡδονήν
εἶναι λέγει· αἰρετὸν δὲ εἶναί φησιν ὁ πρῶτον ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ 10
ἐφ' ἑαυτὸ ἐπισπᾶται πάντως δηλονότι ἐν κινήσει ὑπάρ-
3 χον. Δεινόμαχος δὲ καὶ Καλλιφῶν τέλος εἶναι ἔφασαν
πάν τὸ καθ' αὐτὸν ποιεῖν ἔνεκα τοῦ ἐπιτυχάνειν ἡδονῆς
13W καὶ τυγχάνειν· ὁ τε Ἱερώνυμος ὁ Περιπατητικὸς τέλος 15
μὲν εἶναι τὸ ἀοχλήτως ζῆν, τελικὸν δὲ ἀγαθὸν μόνον τὴν
εὐδαιμονίαν, καὶ Διόδωρος ὁμοίως ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς αἰρέ-
σεως γενόμενος τέλος ἀποφαίνεται τὸ ἀοχλήτως καὶ
καλῶς ζῆν.

1–5 Epicurus F 602b Usener, cf. Theodoret. 11.16, Aelian. VH 4.13 =
F 602a, Sen. Ep. 25.4 = F 602e 1–2 Epicurus F 200c Usener, cf.
Porph. Ad Marc. 30 = F 200a 5–10 Aristipp. 4 A 198 SSR 2, Epicurus
F 450c Usener, cf. D.L. 2.87 = F 450a, D.L. 7.89 = F 450b 7–8 cf.
Theodoret. 11.6 10–12 Epicurus F 406 Usener, cf. Arius Did. apud
Stob. 2 46.17–22 = F 397 n. Usener 12 Deinomachus DPhA 2
(1994) D 30 Callipho DPhA 2 (1994) C 28 14–18 Diodorus F
4h Wehrli, cf. DPhA 2 (1994) D 132

[L = Laurentianus 5.3, s. xi] 1 μηδὲ² Usener: μητὲ L 3 ἀσεβῶς:
ἀσεβῇ Schwartz 5 νίκην: νικᾶν Usener 6 post ἀρχομένων add.
ἴσμεν Hiller, ἀκούομεν Mayor, παρελήφαμεν Früchtel 10 φησιν:
φασιν Menagius 11 ὑπάρχον Hervet: ὑπάρχων L

- 13A** Cicero, *Academici libri* 2.131 = Lucullus 131 (BT t. 42 p. 93.24–94.13 Plasberg)

9cW 131 alii voluptatem finem esse voluerunt, quorum princeps

12 Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies* 2.21 127

- 127 Epicurus, who equates happiness like the gods' with not being hungry, thirsty, or cold, made an impious assertion when he said that in this condition he would vie even with Father Zeus, as if he maintained that the victory in happiness belongs to manure-eating pigs and not to rational beings and philosophers. For both the Cyrenaics and Epicurus belong to those who make pleasure their
 2 principle. The Cyrenaics say explicitly that living pleasantly is the end, and that pleasure is the only complete good. Epicurus says the removal of pain is also a pleasure; and he says that what first on its own entirely attracts us to itself is desirable, which obviously in-
 3 volves a process.¹ Deinomachus and Callipho claimed that the end is doing everything you can for the sake of getting pleasure and succeeding.² Hieronymus the Peripatetic claimed that the end is living untroubled, and that happiness is the only final good; and likewise Diodorus from the same school, declares that the end is living untroubled and honorably.³

From a schematic survey of the diverse accounts of the ethical end in Classical and Hellenistic philosophy; the scheme probably comes from Antiochus of Ascalon, who adapted a sceptical strategy deployed by the Academic Carneades (see Cic. *Fin.* 5.16, **13A** n., **16D** n.). The passage continues by contrasting Epicurus and Callipho (128.1–2); the sequel outlines Aristotle's position (128.3–5, partly in terms used by Critolaus), then Stoic positions (129, concluding with Lyco **10** and Critolaus), various Presocratics and Socratics (130), and finally Plato and three early Academics (131–3). See S. White in this volume.

¹ On the differences between Cyrenaic and Epicurean hedonism, see Annas 227–44, 334–50.

² Callipho was probably a second-century Peripatetic; see White (2002) 90 n. 47. Deinomachus, who is named only alongside him, may have been his student.

³ Cf. **11** n. 3.

13A Cicero, *Academics* 2.131 = *Lucullus* 131

- 131 "Others wanted pleasure to be the end. First of these was

Aristippus, qui Socratem audierat, unde Cyrenaici, post Epicurus, cuius est disciplina nunc [disciplina] notior, nec tamen cum Cyrenaicis de ipsa voluptate consentiens. voluptatem autem et honestatem finem esse Callipho censuit, 5 vacare omni molestia Hieronymus, hoc idem cum honestate Diodorus, ambo hi Peripatetici. honeste autem vivere fruentem rebus iis quas primas homini natura conciliet et vetus Academia censuit, ut indicant scripta Polemonis, quem Antiochus probat maxime, et Aristoteles, eiusque 10 amici huc proxime videntur accedere. introducebat etiam Carneades, non quo probaret sed ut opponeret Stoicis, summum bonum esse frui rebus iis quas primas natura conciliavisset. honeste autem vivere quod ducatur a conciliatione naturae Zeno statuit finem esse bonorum, qui inventor et 15 princeps Stoicorum fuit.

1–16 *Antiochus F 5 Mette* 1–4 *Aristipp. 4 A 178 SSR 2* 3 *Epicurus om. Usener* 5 *Callipho DPhA 2 (1994) C 28* 7 *Diodorus F 4g Wehrli, cf. DPhA 2 (1994) D 132* 4–16 *Polemo F 125 Gigante* 11–16 *Carneades F 5 Mette*

[B, AMN] 3 disciplina *del. A²B², om. N* 5 finem N: finis AB 11 huc *Ursinus*: nunc AB 14 honeste *Davies*: honesta AB: honestum A²B²

13B Cicero, *Academicici libri* 2.138 = *Lucullus* 138 (BT t. 42 p. 97.24–98.5 Plasberg)

- * testatur saepe Chrysippus tris solas esse sententias quae defendi possint de finibus bonorum; circumcidit et amputat multitudinem: aut enim honestatem esse finem, aut voluptatem, aut utrumque. nam qui summum bonum dicant id esse si vacemus omni molestia, eos invidiosum 5

Aristippus, who studied with Socrates. Following him came the Cyrenaics, and later Epicurus, whose theory is now better known, though he does not agree with the Cyrenaics about pleasure itself. But Callipho counted pleasure and virtue as the end; Hieronymus counted being free of all trouble, and Diodorus counted this together with virtue, both of them Peripatetics. But living virtuously in the exercise of all that nature first affiliates to a human was counted as the end by both the old Academy (so show the writings of Polemo, whom Antiochus gives his highest approval)¹ and Aristotle; and his followers are thought to come very close to this view. Carneades even proposed — not because he approved it but to oppose the Stoics — that the greatest good is the exercise of all that nature first affiliates. But Zeno, who was the founder and first of the Stoics, made the end living virtuously, which is derived from natural affiliation.”²

From a response to an expositor of Antiochus’ epistemology by Lucius Licinius Lucullus (c. 120–c. 55, consul 74); Cicero (as a speaker in the dialogue) first presents a lengthy critique (64–111), then explains his own sceptical stance by outlining some fundamental disagreements in physics (116–27), ethics (128–41), and finally epistemology (142–6). The list of rival positions here, which is supposed to make the debate seem undecidable, derives from Carneades (cf. **16A** n., **16D** n.) but reflects earlier work by Chrysippus (cf. **13B**); see K. Algra, “Chrysippus, Carneades, Cicero: the Ethical *Divisiones* in Cicero’s *Lucullus*,” in *Assent and Argument*, ed. B. Inwood and J. Mansfeld (1997) 107–39, and S. White in this volume.

¹ The “old Academy” is an umbrella term used by Antiochus of Ascalon to contrast fourth-century Platonists and Aristotelians with both the sceptical “new Academy” and Stoicism. It embraces Plato, his successors down to Arcesilaus (Speusippus, Xenocrates, Polemo), Aristotle, and Theophrastus.

² “Natural affiliation” (οἰκείωσις) is a Stoic term for innate orientation animals have to survive and develop their natural aptitudes; cf. **16B** n. 1. On the Stoic theory and Antiochus’ use of it, see Annas 262–90.

13B Cicero, *Academics* 2.138 = *Lucullus* 138

“Chrysippus often affirms that there are only three views about the final good that can be defended; he prunes away and cuts out many more: either virtue is the end, he says, or pleasure, or both. After all, those who hold that the greatest good is being free from all trouble, he says, are avoiding the unpopular name of pleasure

nomen voluptatis fugere, sed in vicinitate versari. quod
facere eos etiam qui illud idem cum honestate coniunger-
ent. nec multo secus eos qui ad honestatem prima naturae
commoda adiungerent. ita tris relinquit sententias quas
putet probabiliter posse defendi. 10

1–10 *Chrysipp. F 21 SVF 3* (cf. *Cic. Fin. 2.44, 3.30–1*), *Polemo F 126 Gigante*

[*B, AFMN*] 1 tris NF^2 : ty *A*: tis *B* quae F^2 : qua *AB* 2 finibus F^2
 M^2 : finitis *AB* 4 utrumque A^2N : utrum *AB* 10 putet ANB^2 : putat *B*

14 Cicero, *De finibus* 5.72–3 (OCT p. 209.28–210.12 Reynolds)

hinc ceteri particulas arripere conati suam quisque vide-
73 ri voluit adferre sententiam. saepe ab Aristotele, a Theo-
phrasto mirabiliter est laudata per se ipsa rerum scientia;
hoc uno captus Erillus scientiam summum bonum esse
defendit nec rem ullam aliam per se expetendam. multa 5
sunt dicta ab antiquis de contemnendis ac despiciendis
rebus humanis; hoc unum Aristo tenuit: praeter vitia
atque virtutes negavit rem esse ullam aut fugiendam aut
8dW expetendam. positum est a nostris in iis esse rebus quae
secundum naturam essent non dolere; hoc Hieronymus 10
summum bonum esse dixit. at vero Callipho et post eum
Diodorus, cum alter voluptatem adamavisset, alter vacui-
tatem doloris, neuter honestate carere potuit, quae est a
nostris laudata maxime.

1–14 *Antiochus F 9 Mette* 1–5 *Theophr. F 480A FHS&G* 4–5
Herillus F 417b SVF 1 5–9 *Aristo Chius F 366 SVF 1* 9–14
Diodorus F 4e Wehrli 11 *Callipho DPhA 2 (1994) C 28*

[*MOS, RP, BE*] 9 expetendam *SP*: petendam *cett.*

15 Iamblichus, *De anima*, apud Stobaeum, *Anthologium* 1.49.42 (t.
1 p. 382.17–383.14 Wachsmuth)

[ἐν ταύτῳ]
περὶ τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς τῶν ψυχῶν

but inhabit its neighborhood. So too, he says, those who combine pleasure with virtue do the same; nor do those do much different who join the primary attractions of nature to virtue.³⁰ Thus he leaves three views that he thinks can be reasonably defended.”

Shortly after **13A**; Cicero summarizes a critique of hedonism by Chrysippus. Although Hieronymus is not named, the second sentence echoes the formulation of his position in **13A**, which suggests that his position was one of the main targets of Chrysippus’ critique.

¹ **13A** ascribes the first of these two positions to Callipho, the second to the “old Academy” (including Aristotle).

14 Cicero, *On Ends* 5.72–3

“All the others tried to adopt parts of this account, each with the
73 aim of seeming to propose a view of his own. Knowledge is often marvelously praised for its own sake by Aristotle and Theophrastus; but Herillus, captivated by this alone, maintained that knowledge is the greatest good and nothing else at all is desirable for itself.¹ Scorn and disregard for human affairs the ancients discuss at length; but Aristo clung to this alone and denied that anything except the vices and virtues is either undesirable or desirable.² Not being in pain our school ranks among the natural things; but Hieronymus said this is the greatest good. Or again, although Callipho became enamored with pleasure and Diodorus after him with absence of pain, neither of them could do without virtue, which our school praises the most.”³

From the conclusion of Piso’s account of Peripatetic ethics; after contrasting it with other theories (73), he charges the Stoics with adopting the same position under different labels (74).

¹ Herillus of Carthage was a heterodox student of the Stoic Zeno; see D.L. 7.165–6 and A. M. Ioppolo, “Lo stoicismo di Erillo,” *Phronesis* 30 (1985) 58–78.

² Aristo of Chios was a student, then critic of the Stoic Zeno; see D.L. 7.160–4 and A. M. Ioppoli, *Aristone di Chio* (1980) 19–38.

³ For Callipho, see **12** n. 2; for Diodorus, **11** n. 3.

15 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 1.49.42: from Iamblichus, *On Soul*

There has arisen a dispute about what association souls have with the gods: some claim it is impossible for gods to mingle with

γέγονέ τις διαμφισβήτησις, τῶν μὲν λεγόντων ἀδύνατον
 μίγνυσθαι θεοὺς ταῖς κατεχομέναις ψυχαῖς ἐν τῷ σώμα- 5
 τι, τῶν δὲ διατεινομένων μίαν εἶναι κοινήν πολιτείαν
 τῶν καθαρῶν ψυχῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ εἰ ὅτι μάλιστα
 ἐν τοῖς σώμασι διατρίβουσιν. οἱ δὲ μόνοις δαίμοσιν ἢ
 καὶ ἥρωσιν ὑποτιθέασιν αὐτάς εἰς κοινήν συνουσίαν,
 ἄλλοι μὲν οἱ βελτίονες κρινόμενοι κατὰ Πλάτωνα
 καθάρσει καὶ ἀναγωγῇ καὶ τελειώσει τῆς ψυχῆς, ἄλλοι 10
 δὲ οἱ χείρονες τοῖς ἐναντίοις τούτων ἀντιδιαστελλό-
 μενοι, κατὰ δὲ τοὺς Στωικοὺς τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ τῷ καλῷ
 12 W τῷ τῆς φύσεως ἐξηρητημένῳ, κατὰ δὲ τοὺς Περιπατητι-
 κοὺς τῇ κατὰ φύσιν τε συμμετρίᾳ καὶ τῇ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀνθρω-
 πίνην φύσιν νοερᾷ ζωῇ προτιμώμενοι, κατὰ δὲ Ἑριλλων 15
 ἐπιστήμη, κατὰ δὲ Ἀρίστων ἀδιαφορία, κατὰ δὲ Δημό-
 κριτον εὐσχημοσύνη, κατὰ δὲ τοὺς ἄλλους μέρει τινὶ
 τοῦ καλοῦ, ἢ τῇ ἀοχλησίᾳ καθ' Ἱερώνυμον, ἢ ἄλλοις
 τισὶ τρόποις διαγωγῆς τὸ αἰρετὸν ἔχοντες, ἀφ' ὧν οἱ κατὰ
 μέρος φύονται βίοι ἄπειροι περὶ τὴν γένεσιν διαιρού- 20
 μενοι, περὶ ὧν οὐδὲν δεῖ πολυπραγμονεῖν, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ
 ἄπειρον αὐτοὺς μεθιέντας χαίρειν ἔαν.

2–22 Aristo Chius F 379 SVF 1 2–8 Iambl. De an. 34 5–7 cf.
 Chrysipp. F 333–9 SVF 3 9–22 Iambl. De an. 35 9–10 cf. Plat.
 Phaedo 69A–C, 80D–E, Plot. 1.2.3–4, Porph. Sent. 32 9–16 Herillus
 F 420 SVF 1 16 Democritus om. DK, cf. 68 A 166–9 DK 21–2
 cf. Plat. Phileb. 16E2

[FP] 1 *titulum* ἐν ταύτῳ (sc. Iamblichi De anima) add. Wachsmuth
 (cf. 362.23 n.) 8 αὐτάς Wachsmuth: αὐτὴν codd. post συν-
 ουσίαν lac. indic. Wachsmuth, hinc novam eclogam constituit (ἄλλοι
 sc. βίοι, vid. Corrigenda p. xxv): add. ὧν von Arnim, πολυειδῶς
 διαφέρονται οἱ βίοι Festugière, praeterea αἰρετοὶ κατὰ τοὺς
 φιλοσόφους Finamore-Dillon 11 ἐναντίοις Wachsmuth: ἐναντίως
 codd. 17 εὐσχημοσύνη: εὐθημοσύνη Meineke 18 ἀνοχλησίᾳ F:
 ἀνοχλησίᾳ P

souls that are contained in the body; others maintain that there is a single mutual society for the gods and pure souls, even if they spend most of this life in the body.¹ Others grant souls mutual interaction only with spirits or even heroes.² Some of these, the better ones, follow Plato in making the purification, elevation, and perfection of the soul the criterion.³ But others, who are inferior, draw distinctions with criteria contrary to those: with the Stoics, by the society and the morality dependent on nature; or with the Peripatetics, by the natural symmetry and the intellectual life superior to human nature; or with Herillus, by understanding; or with Aristo, by indifference; or with Democritus, by decorum;⁴ or with the rest, defining the desirable by a part of morality, either untroubledness as Hieronymus does, or some other modes of conduct.⁵ From these there arise the innumerable particular lives that are distinguished in their origin,⁶ which we need not belabor; rather, we should dismiss them as indefinite.

From a series of excerpts “On Soul” (1.49). This passage has no heading in the mss. but follows a series of excerpts (1.49.32–43) which it resembles in diction, thought, and format, and most of which (33–8, 40–1, 43) bear the heading “in the same [sc. work]”; Wachsmuth assigns the first (32) and hence the rest to a lost work *On Soul* by Iamblichus, which is the source of a related excerpt (1.48.8; see Finamore and Dillon, *Iamblichus, De anima* [2002] 171–7). The passage lists conflicting views about human interactions with the divine: none in this life, or a virtual society; then, only with spirits or heroes, and only “purified” souls or also the virtuous. The views in this last group reflect Antiochus’ scheme (cf. **13A, 16A–D**); and the parallel with **14** is striking: Herillus, Aristo, and Hieronymus are listed in the same sequence (cf. *Acad.* 2.129–30), then criticized for the same reason (isolating “a part of morality”).

¹The latter alludes to the Stoic conception of the cosmos as a universal society embracing all rational beings, divine and human alike; cf. *SVF* 3.333–9 and M. Schofield, *The Stoic Idea of the City* (1991) 57–92.

² Wachsmuth posits a lacuna here and presents the rest of the passage as a separate excerpt. “Spirits” are minor deities and “heroes” the deified dead.

³ Viz. the “criterion” for whether a soul has any interaction with spirits or heroes. For this contrast between “purified” and “moral” virtues, see Plato *Phaedo* 69A–C, 80D–E, Plotinus *Ennead* 1.2, Porphyry *Sentences* 32.

⁴ Cf. Cic. *Fin.* 5.23. Democritus is the only Presocratic who figures significantly in Hellenistic ethical debates; see J. Annas, “Democritus and Eudaimonism,” in *Presocratic Philosophy*, ed. V. Caston and D. Graham (2002) 169–81.

⁵ If “untroubledness” is a “part of morality” (literally “the honorable”) then it includes or presupposes virtue.

⁶ Perhaps an allusion to the “primary natural things” on which Antiochus based his scheme; cf. **16D** n.

16A Cicero, *Tusculanae disputationes* 5.84–5 (BT t. 44 p. 442.22–443.11 Pohlenz)

9fW sunt autem hae de finibus, ut opinor, retentae defensae-
 que sententiae. primum simplices quattuor: nihil bonum
 nisi honestum, ut Stoici; nihil bonum nisi voluptatem, ut
 Epicurus; nihil bonum nisi vacuitatem <doloris>, ut Hier-
 onymus; nihil bonum nisi naturae primis bonis aut omnibus 5
 aut maximis frui, ut Carneades contra Stoicos disserebat.
 85 haec igitur simplicia, illa mixta: tria genera bonorum,
 maxima animi, secunda corporis, externa tertia, ut Peri-
 patetici nec multo veteres Academici secus; voluptatem
 cum honestate Dinomachus et Callipho copulavit; indol- 10
 entiam autem honestati Peripateticus Diodorus adiunxit.
 haec sunt sententiae quae stabilitatis aliquid habeant; nam
 Aristonis, Pyrrhonis, Erilli, non nullorumque aliorum evan-
 uerunt. hi quid possint optinere videamus omissis Stoicis,
 quorum satis videor defendisse sententiam. 15

1–12 *Antiochus F 10 Mette* 1–6 *Carneades F 7a Mette* 4 *Epicurus om. Usener* 7–11 *Diodorus F 4f Wehrli* 10 *Deinomachus DPhA 2 (1994) D 30, Callipho DPhA 2 (1994) C 28* 12–14 *Aristo Chius F 363c SVF 1, Pyrrho F 69L Decleva Caizzi*

[GKRV] 4 doloris *add. Bentley* 5 bonis *del. Goerenz*

16B Cicero, *De finibus* 2.35 (OCT p. 56.8–21 Reynolds)

9bW 35 ita tres sunt fines expertes honestatis, unus Aristippi vel
 Epicuri, alter Hieronymi, Carneadi tertius; tres in quibus
 honestas cum aliqua accessione: Polemonis, Calliphontis,
 Diodori; una simplex, cuius Zeno auctor, posita in decore 5
 tota, id est <in> honestate; nam Pyrrho, Aristo, Erillus iam
 diu abiecti. reliqui sibi constiterunt ut extrema cum initiis
 convenirent, ut Aristippo voluptas, Hieronymo doloris
 vacuitas, Carneadi frui principiis naturalibus esset extre-
 mum. Epicurus autem cum in prima commendatione
 voluptatem dixisset, si eam quam Aristippus, idem tenere 10
 debuit ultimum bonorum quod ille; sin eam quam Hiero-
 nymus, fecisset idem ut voluptatem illam [Aristippi] in

16A Cicero, *Tusculan Discussions* 5.84–5

“The following views about the end, however, are still maintained and defended. First, four simple views: nothing is good unless honorable, as the Stoics hold; nothing is good except pleasure, as Epicurus holds; nothing is good except absence <of pain>, as Hieronymus holds; and nothing is good except employing the primary natural goods, either all or most, as Carneades used to
85 argue against the Stoics. Those, then, are simple, and these are mixed: the three classes of goods, foremost the mind’s, second the body’s, and externals third, as the Peripatetics hold, and the old Academics not much differently; pleasure is united with virtue by Deinomachus and Callipho; but painlessness is added to virtue by the Peripatetic Diodorus. These are the views that have some enduring power; for those of Aristo, Pyrrho, Herillus, and many others have disappeared. Let’s see what these can maintain, excepting the Stoics, whose view I think I have adequately defended.”

Book 5 rebuts the thesis that virtue is not sufficient for a good life (12); the speaker (anonymous but effectively identical with Cicero), after building a case mainly from Stoic views (12–82), turns to other theories, which he lists according to a scheme adapted from Carneades by Antiochus (cf. **13A**, **16D**); **17** follows immediately. On this central issue in Hellenistic ethics, see Annas 385–425.

16B Cicero, *On Ends* 2.35

35 “Thus three views omit virtue: first Aristippus or Epicurus, then Hieronymus, and Carneades third. Three views have virtue with some addition: Polemo’s, Callipho’s, and Diodorus’. One, which Zeno introduced, is single, placed entirely in nobility, that is, in virtue. For Pyrrho, Aristo, and Herillus have long since been dismissed. The rest established ends consistent with their starting points: Aristippus pleasure, Hieronymus absence of pain, and Carneades employing the primary natural things. Epicurus, however, since he included pleasure in the first affiliation, if he meant the same pleasure as Aristippus, should hold the same end as he did; but if he meant the same pleasure as Hieronymus, he would have included that pleasure in the first affiliation.”¹

prima commendatione poneret.

1–12 *Antiochus F 9a Mette* 1–9 *Aristipp. 4 A 184 SSR 2, Carneades F 6 Mette* 1–5 *Polemo F 127 Gigante, Chrysipp. F 14 SVF 3, Diodorus F 3a Wehrli* 2 *Epicurus om. F 398 Usener* 4 *Callipho DPhA 2 (1994) C 28* 5–6 *Pyrrho F 69M Decleva Caizzi, Aristo Chius F 363a SVF 1*

[A, MOS, RP, BE] 2 *Carneadi ARBE* : *Carneadis A²MOSP* (cf. *Fin. 5.4*) 5 in *add. ed. Romana (1471)* 12 *fecisset* : *ne fecissent Schiche* *post idem lac. stat. Mette* *Aristippi del. Marsus*

16C Cicero, *De finibus* 4.49–50 (OCT p. 155.19–156.2 Reynolds)

10c W Aristoteles, Xenocrates, tota illa familia non dabit, quippe qui valetudinem, vires, divitias, gloriam, multa alia bona esse dicant, laudabilia non dicant. et hi quidem ita non sola virtute finem bonorum contineri putant ut rebus tamen omnibus virtutem anteponant; quid censes eos esse facturos qui omnino virtutem a bonorum fine segregaverunt, Epicurum, Hieronymum, illos etiam, si qui Carneadeum 5
50 finem tueri volunt? iam aut Callipho aut Diodorus quomodo poterunt tibi istud concedere, qui ad honestatem aliud adiungant quod ex eodem genere non sit? 10

1–5 *Xenocrates F 90 Heinze* = *F 247 Isnardi Parente, Polemo F 135 Gigante* 3–10 *Antiochus F 9b Mette* 5–8 *Carneades F 6 Mette* 7 *Epicurus om. Usener* 8–10 *Diodorus F 3b Wehrli*

[MOS, RP, BE] 7 *si qui BE, P in rasura* : *sequi MOSRP* 10 *adiungant MOSRP* : *adiungunt BE*

16D Cicero, *De finibus* 5.20 (OCT p. 180.28–181.4 Reynolds)

9e W 20 expositis iam igitur sex de summo bono sententiis trium proximarum hi principes: voluptatis Aristippus, non dolendi Hieronymus, fruendi rebus iis quas primas secundum naturam esse diximus Carneades, non ille quidem auctor

From a critique of Epicurean hedonism delivered by Cicero in his own voice. Here he uses Carneades' scheme (cf. **13A**, **16D**) to challenge the Epicurean conception of pleasure, which he charges with equivocation (cf. **18A-C**).

¹ "First affiliation" (πρῶτον οἰκεῖον) is a Stoic term for the objects of basic natural drives or desires; cf. **16D** n. and **13A** n. 2. On the Stoic theory and Antiochus' use of it, see Annas 262–90.

16C Cicero, *On Ends* 4.49–50

"Aristotle, Xenocrates, and that entire family will disagree,¹ because they hold that health, strength, wealth, fame, and many other things are good but deny these are praiseworthy. And yet, while they hold that the final good does not consist in virtue alone, they nonetheless rank virtue ahead of everything. What do you think those are going to do who exclude virtue entirely from the final good: Epicurus, Hieronymus, even any who want to maintain
50 the Carneadean end? Or how could either Callipho or Diodorus, who join to virtue something else not from the same class, grant you that point?"

From a critique of Stoic ethics delivered by Cicero in his own voice and based mainly on Antiochus (cf. **11**, **12**, **16D** n.). Here he contests the Stoic thesis that nothing is good except virtue (or virtuous people or conduct).

¹ "Entire family" refers to the "old Academy"; cf. **13A** n. 1.

16D Cicero, *On Ends* 5.20

20 "Given these six views of the greatest good, the champions for the last three are these: Aristippus for pleasure, Hieronymus for absence of pain, and Carneades for employing what we called the primary natural things, though not as its proponent but only as an

sed defensor disserendi causa fuit.

5

1–5 *Aristipp.* 4 A 187 SSR 2, *Carneades* F 6 *Mette*, *Antiochus* F 9 *Mette*

- 17 Cicero, *Tusculanae disputationes* 5.85–8 (BT t. 44 p. 443.12–444.16 Pohlenz)

et Peripateticorum quidem explicata causa est praeter
Theophrastum et si qui illum secuti imbecillius horrent
dolorem et reformidant. reliquis quidem licet facere id
quod fere faciunt, ut gravitatem dignitatemque virtutis
exaggerent. quam cum ad caelum extulerunt, quod facere 5
eloquentes homines copiose solent, reliqua ex conlatione
facile est conterere atque contemnere. nec enim licet iis
qui laudem cum dolore petendam esse dicant negare eos
esse beatos qui illam adepti sunt. quamquam enim sint in
quibusdam malis, tamen hoc nomen beati longe et late 10
86 patet. nam ut quaestuosa mercatura, fructuosa aratio dici-
tur, non si altera semper omni damno, altera omni tem-
pestatis calamitate semper vacat, sed si multo maiore ex
parte exstat in utraque felicitas, sic vita non solum si un-
dique referta bonis est, sed si multo maiore et graviore ex 15
87 parte bona propendent, beata recte dici potest. sequetur
igitur horum ratione vel ad supplicium beata vita virtu-
tem, cumque ea descendet in taurum Aristotele, Xeno-
crate, Speusippo, Polemone auctoribus, nec eam minis
blandimentisve corrupta deseret. eadem Calliphontis erit 20
10dW Diodorique sententia, quorum uterque honestatem sic
complectitur ut omnia quae sine ea sint longe [et] retro
ponenda censeat. reliqui habere se videntur angustius,
enatant tamen: Epicurus, Hieronymus, et si qui sunt qui
desertum illud Carneadeum curent defendere. nemo est 25

advocate for the sake of argument.”

Piso (cf. 11) describes how Antiochus adapted a sceptical strategy of Carneades to support his own avowedly Aristotelian theory (cf. 12, 13A). He first lists three primary objects of desire (16–17): pleasure, absence of pain, and “primary natural things” (roughly, sound body and mind). He then specifies three possible ways of taking these as ends (18–19): obtaining one of them, or merely trying to obtain one of them, or combining one of them with virtue. This yields nine possible accounts of the end: Piso here names proponents of the first three “simple” accounts; in the sequel (20–2), he names proponents for four other accounts (the Stoics and three “complex” accounts, as in 16A and 16B; cf. 13A), then summarily dismisses all except the Peripatetics.

17 Cicero, *Tusculan Discussions* 5.85–8

“The case for the Peripatetics too has been expounded, except for Theophrastus and any who follow him in having so frail a fear and dread of pain.¹ All the other Peripatetics, of course, are free to do just what they usually do, to exalt the importance and dignity of virtue; and after they elevate virtue to the sky, as eloquent people typically do at length, it is easy to overcome and scorn everything else by comparison. For those who hold that we should strive for praise even when in pain are not free to deny that those who attain it are happy, since even though they face some ills, this title of
86 happiness still reaches far and wide. For just as a business is said to be profitable or a farm fruitful not if the one is always free of any loss at all or the other always free of any bad season, but rather if each is for the most part prosperous, so likewise a life can be correctly called happy not only if it is filled with all kinds of good, but if the good predominates in the larger and more important part.²
87 Happiness, therefore, by their argument will follow virtue even under torture and enter the bull together with it,³ on the authority of Aristotle, Xenocrates, Speusippus, and Polemo; nor will threats or temptations ruin happiness by inducing it to abandon virtue.

“Calliphon and Diodorus will have the same view, since they each embraces virtue so firmly that they count everything that lacks it as falling far behind. All the others, though they seem to be in a tighter spot, still swim free: Epicurus, Hieronymus, and any who care to defend that abandoned Carneadean view. For there is

enim eorum quin bonorum animum putet esse iudicem
 eumque condocafaciat, ut ea quae bona malave videantur
 88 possit contemnere. nam quae tibi Epicuri videtur, eadem
 erit Hieronymi et Carneadis causa et hercule omnium
 reliquorum. quis enim parum est contra mortem aut 30
 dolorem paratus?

1–11 *Theophr.* F 499 *FHS&G* 16–20 *Speusippus* F 78c *Tarán*,
Xenocrates F 84 *Heinze* = F 241 *Isnardi Parente*, *Polemo* F 134
Gigante 16–23 *Diodorus* F 5 *Wehrli* 20–31 *Antiochus* F 10 *Mette*
 23–31 *Carneades* F 7a *Mette* 24 *Epicurus om.* F 122c *Usener*
 25–8 nemo ... contemnere: *Nonius* 82.20

[GKRV] 5 extulerunt *Madvig*: extulerint *codd.* 11 aratio *recc.*:
 ratio *codd.* 12 omni¹ *Ursinus*: omnis *codd.* 17 horum *recc.*:
 honorum *codd.* 20 minis blandimentisve *Pohlenz*: minimis bland-
 imentis *codd.*: minis aut blandimentis *Bentley*: nimiis blandimentis
Schiche 22 et del. *Wesenberg* 25 illud *Bake*: illum *codd.* post
Carneadeum add. finem *Pohlenz* 26 eorum quin *Lambinus*: qui
 eorum *codd.*: qui in eorum *Nonius* 28 quae ... *Epicuri recc.*: quod
 ... *Epicurus codd.*

18A Cicero, *De finibus* 2.8–9 (OCT p. 40.19–41.6 Reynolds)

8 “verum hoc loco sumo verbis his eandem certe vim vol-
 uptatis Epicurum nosse quam ceteros. omnes enim iucun-
 dum motum quo sensus hilaretur Graece ἡδονήν, Latine
 voluptatem vocant.”

“quid est igitur” inquit “quod requiras?” 5

“dicam,” inquam, “et quidem discendi causa magis quam
 quo te aut Epicurum reprehensum velim.”

“ego quoque” inquit “didicerim libentius, si quid attul-
 eris, quam te reprehenderim.”

8aW “tenesne igitur” inquam “Hieronymus Rhodius quid 10
 dicat esse summum bonum, quo putet omnia referri oportere?”

“teneo” inquit “finem illi videri nihil dolere.”

“quid? idem iste” inquam “de voluptate quid sentit?”

9 “negat esse eam” inquit “propter se expetendam.” 15

not one of them who does not think that the mind is the judge of these goods and teaches it to be able to scorn all that may seem
88 good or bad. After all, the case you think Epicurus has, Hieronymus and Carneades will also have, and so by Hercules will all the rest.⁴ For who is too little prepared to face death or pain?"

Continuation of **16A**.

¹ Cicero voices similar complaints in *Tusc.* 5.24–5, *Acad.* 1.33–5, *Fin.* 5.12, 5.85–6; see Annas 385–8.

² Cicero draws similar analogies in *Fin.* 5.91 (cf. *Tusc.* 5.51 from Critolaus) and 3.45 (Stoics); cf. White (2002) 89.

³ The "bull" alludes to a device for torture reportedly used by the infamous Greek tyrant Phalaris (Arist. F 611.69 Rose, cf. **35** n. 1).

⁴ Cicero here assimilates these positions only on the very general ground that they do not explicitly include virtue in their accounts of the end; cf. **16A**, **23** n.

18A Cicero, *On Ends* 2.8–9

8 "But on this point I take it that Epicurus meant by these words exactly the same idea of pleasure as everyone else did. For an agreeable feeling in which the senses delight everyone calls *hedone* in Greek or pleasure in Latin."

"Then what," he said, "is your question?"

"I'll tell you," I said, "and of course more in order to learn than because I wish to criticize you or Epicurus."

"I too," he said, "would prefer to learn something, if you have anything to offer, rather than criticize you."

"Then do you recall," I said, "what Hieronymus of Rhodes says is the greatest good to which he thinks everything should be referred?"

"I do recall," he said. "He believes the end is having no pain."

"Now this same man," I said, "what does he think about pleasure?"

9 "He denies," he said, "it is intrinsically desirable."

“aliud igitur esse censet gaudere, aliud non dolere.”

1–2 verum ... voluptatis: *Nonius* 396.11 1–4 verum ... vocant:
Nonius 121.24 2 *Epicurus om. Usener*

[*A, MOS, RP, BE*] 1 verbis: de verbis *Nonius* 3 hilaretur *recc.*,
Nonius: hiaretur *AMORBE*: hiarentur *P*: hiarent *SP*² 7 reprehensum
SR: repensum *A*¹: reprehensum *ceff.*

18B Cicero, *De finibus* 2.15–16 (OCT p. 44.24–45.9 Reynolds)

quamquam non negatis nos intellegere quid sit voluptas,
sed quid ille dicat. e quo efficitur, non ut nos non intelleg-
amus quae vis sit istius verbi, sed ut ille suo more loquatur,
10a W 16 nostrum neglegat. si enim idem dicit quod Hieronymus, qui 5
censet summum bonum esse sine ulla molestia vivere, cur
mavult dicere voluptatem quam vacuitatem doloris, ut ille
facit qui quid dicat intellegit? sin autem voluptatem putat
adiungendam eam quae sit in motu — sic enim appellat
hanc dulcem “in motu,” illam nihil dolentis “in stabilitate”
— quid tendit? cum efficere non possit ut cuiquam qui ipse 10
sibi notus sit, hoc est qui suam naturam sensumque per-
spexerit, vacuitas doloris et voluptas idem esse videatur.

7–9 *Epicurus F I n. Usener, cf. Fin. 2.31, 2.75, 2.77, D.L. 10.136 = F*
1–2 *Usener*

4 dicit *ABE*: dicat *MOSRP* 7 putat *BE*: putat dicat *ASRP*: dicat *MO*

18C Cicero, *De finibus* 2.19–20 (OCT p. 47.1–18 Reynolds)

9a W 19 multi enim et magni philosophi haec ultima bonorum
iuncta fecerunt, ut Aristoteles virtutis usum cum vitae
perfectae prosperitate coniunxit, Callipho adiunxit ad
honestatem voluptatem, Diodorus ad eandem honestatem
addidit vacuitatem doloris. idem fecisset Epicurus, si 5
sententiam hanc quae nunc Hieronymi est coniunxisset
cum Aristippi vetere sententia. illi enim inter se dissentiunt.

“So he thinks enjoyment is one thing, absence of pain something else.”

From Cicero’s critique of Epicurean ethics (cf. **16B**); he begins by questioning its designated proponent, his friend Lucius Manlius Torquatus (c. 90–46, praetor 49), about the Epicurean concept of pleasure. His argument poses a double dilemma: Epicurus either equivocates about pleasure (often conflating it with absence of pain) or not; but if not, then his concept of pleasure must be the same as either Cyrenaic feelings or Hieronymus’ absence of pain.

18B Cicero, *On Ends* 2.15–16

“And yet you say we understand what pleasure is, but not what he means. From this it follows, not that we do not understand what this word means, but that he talks in his own way and ignores ours.
16 For if he means the same as Hieronymus, who thinks that living without any trouble is the greatest good, why does he prefer to say ‘pleasure’ rather than ‘absence of pain,’ as Hieronymus does, who does understand what he means? If, on the other hand, he thinks that kinetic pleasure — for he calls this sweet pleasure ‘kinetic’ and the other one of feeling no pain ‘stable’ — what is his point? Since he cannot establish that anyone who is himself aware of himself — that is, anyone who has perceived his own nature and senses — thinks that pleasure and absence of pain are the same thing.”

Shortly after **18A**. Cicero relates his challenge to the Epicurean distinction between “kinetic” (literally “in change or process”) and “katastematic” (literally “static or stable”) pleasures; the former are events or processes, the latter is an enduring state. On this distinction, see G. Striker, “Epicurean Hedonism,” in her *Essays on Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics* (1996) 196–208, and J. Cooper, “Pleasure and Desire in Epicurus,” in his *Reason and Emotion* (1999) 485–514.

18C Cicero, *On Ends* 2.19–20

19 “For many great philosophers have held that the ultimate good is composite: Aristotle combined the exercise of virtue with prosperity in a perfect life; Callipho joined pleasure to virtue; to this same virtue Diodorus added the absence of pain. Epicurus would have done the same if he had combined the view that now belongs to Hieronymus with the older view of Aristippus. For those two are

propterea singulis finibus utuntur et, cum uterque Graece
 egregie loquatur, nec Aristippus, qui voluptatem summum
 bonum dicit, in voluptate ponit non dolere, neque Hiero- 10
 nymus, qui summum bonum statuit non dolere, voluptatis
 nomine umquam utitur pro illa indolentia, quippe qui ne in
 20 expetendis quidem rebus numeret voluptatem. duae sunt
 enim res quoque, ne tu verba solum putes. unum est sine
 dolore esse, alterum cum voluptate. 15

1–13 *Antiochus F 9a Mette, Aristipp. 4 A 183 SSR 2* 1–5 *Diodorus
 F 4a Wehrli* 2–3 *cf. Arist. EN 1.10 1101a14–16* 3 *Callipho DPha
 2 (1994) C 28* 5 *Epicurus om. Usener*

19 Cicero, *De finibus* 2.32 (OCT p. 54.22–55.3 Reynolds)

10b W 32 nec tamen argumentum hoc Epicurus a parvis petivit aut
 etiam a bestiis, quae putat esse specula naturae, ut diceret
 ab iis duce natura hanc voluptatem expeti nihil dolendi.
 nec enim haec movere potest appetitum animi, nec ullum
 habet ictum quo pellat animum status hic non dolendi; 5
 itaque in hoc eodem peccat Hieronymus. at ille pellit qui
 permulcet sensum voluptate; itaque Epicurus semper hoc
 utitur ut probet voluptatem natura expeti, quod ea volup-
 tas quae in motu sit et parvos ad se adliciat et bestias, non
 illa stabilis in qua tantum inest nihil dolere. qui igitur 10
 convenit ab alia voluptate dicere naturam proficisci, in alia
 summum bonum ponere?

1–10 *Epicurus F 398 Usener*

5 *animum status Manutius: animi statum codd.* 10 *nihil AMOSRP:*
non BE qui *Lambinus: quid codd.*

20A Cicero, *De finibus* 2.41 (OCT p. 58.11–27 Reynolds)

41 atque haec contra Aristippum, qui eam voluptatem non
 modo summam sed solam etiam ducit quam omnes unam
 appellamus voluptatem. aliter autem vobis placet. sed ille,
 ut dixi, vitiose. nec enim figura corporis nec ratio excel-

in disagreement. Therefore, they adopt simple ends, and since each speaks Greek most excellently, neither does Aristippus (who holds that pleasure is the greatest good) count not feeling pain as pleasure, nor does Hieronymus (who maintained that not feeling pain is the greatest good) ever use the word ‘pleasure’ for that painlessness, since he does not even count pleasure as something intrinsically desirable. For there are also two things here, lest you believe it is only a matter of words. It is one thing to be without pain, another to be with pleasure.”

Shortly after **18B**; Cicero relates his challenge to Carneades’ dialectical scheme (cf. **13A**, **16D**).

19 Cicero, *On Ends* 2.32

32 “Yet Epicurus did not in this argument appeal to children or even to animals, which he believes are mirrors of nature, nor did he claim that they are led by nature to want this pleasure of feeling no pain.⁴⁶ For neither can this pleasure stimulate an appetite in the soul, nor does this state of not feeling pain have any force to drive the soul; hence Hieronymus makes the very same mistake. But that state which soothes the senses does drive the soul; hence Epicurus always uses this to prove that pleasure is naturally wanted, because this kinetic pleasure attracts both children and animals, not that stable pleasure which consists only in feeling no pain. Therefore, how is it consistent to say that nature starts from one pleasure, but to put the greatest good in another?”

Shortly before **16B**; Cicero renews his charge of equivocation (cf. **18A**) by questioning the motivational force of Epicurus’ “stable” pleasure (cf. **18B**), which Cicero equates with absence of pain.

¹ On Epicurean appeals to infant and animal behavior, see J. Brunschwig, “The Cradle Argument in Epicureanism and Stoicism,” in *Norms of Nature*, ed. M. Schofield and G. Striker (1986) 113–44.

20A Cicero, *On Ends* 2.41

41 “But these count against Aristippus, who holds that this pleasure which alone we all call pleasure is not only the greatest but also the only pleasure. You people, however, take a different position. But Aristippus, as I said, is wrong; for neither the shape of the

138 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

8bW lens ingeni humani significat ad unam hanc rem natum 5
hominem, ut frueretur voluptatibus. nec vero audiendus
Hieronymus, cui summum bonum est idem quod vos
interdum vel potius nimium saepe dicitis: nihil dolere. non
enim, si malum est dolor, carere eo malo satis est ad bene
vivendum. hoc dixerit potius Ennius: 10

 nimium boni est, cui nihil est mali.
nos beatam vitam non depulsione mali sed adeptione boni
iudicemus, nec eam cessando, sive gaudentem ut Aristip-
pus, sive non dolentem ut hic, sed agendo aliquid consid-
erandove quaeramus. 15

1–3 *Aristipp. 4 A 185 SSR 2* 7–8 *Epicurus F 419c Usener* 11
Ennius F 173 Jocelyn, cf. Eur. Hecuba 627–8

2 ducit *AMOSRP*: dicit *BE* 14 dolentem *ABE*: dolendo *MOSRP*

20B Cicero, *Tusculanae disputationes* 2.15 (BT t. 44 p. 287.10–19 Pohlenz)

9dW primum igitur de inbecillitate multorum et de variis
disciplinis philosophorum loquar. quorum princeps et
auctoritate et antiquitate Socraticus Aristippus non dubi-
tavit summum malum dolorem dicere. deinde ad hanc
enervatam muliebremque sententiam satis docilem se 5
Epicurus praebuit. hunc post Rhodius Hieronymus dolore
vacare summum bonum dixit: tantum in dolore duxit mali.
ceteri praeter Zenonem, Aristonem, Pyrrhoidem fere quod
modo tu: malum illud quidem sed alia peiora.

1–9 *Pyrrho F 69G Decleva Caizzi* 1–6 *Aristipp. 4 A 204 SSR 2*
3–6 *Epicurus F 401a Usener* 8 *cf. Zeno Cit. F 185 SVF 1*

[*GKRV*] 7 dolore vacare *GKV*: vacare dolore *R* 9 quod modo
edd.: quomodo *codd.*

21 Pomponius Porphyrio, *Commentarii in Horati Epistulas* 1.6.65 (p. 325.22–6 Holder)

14W “si, Mimnermus uti censet”: Mimnermus elegiarum
scriptor fuit. in quadam egloga Hieronymi sectam com-

human body nor the outstanding reason of human intelligence suggests that people are born for this one thing, to enjoy pleasures. Nor should we listen to Hieronymus, who says the greatest good is the same as what you say sometimes, or rather too often: feeling no pain. For it is not the case that, if pain is bad, not having it is enough for a good life. Ennius said this instead: ‘One who has nothing bad has too much good.’ We should judge happiness not by the avoidance of bad but by the realization of good, and we should seek it not in rest, whether in enjoyment as Aristippus does or in not feeling pain as Hieronymus does, but in doing something or reflecting.”

Shortly after **16B**; Cicero concludes his charge of equivocation by contrasting Epicurus with other views (2.39–43).

20B Cicero, *Tusculan Discussions* 2.15

“So I shall first speak about the frailty and divergent theories of many philosophers. First of these in both influence and antiquity is the Socratic Aristippus, who did not hesitate to say pain is the worst evil. Next Epicurus revealed himself to be quite susceptible to this feeble and womanly view. After him Hieronymus of Rhodes said that absence of pain is the greatest good: so much bad did he attribute to pain. The rest, except Zeno, Aristo, and Pyrrho, say nearly the same as you did just now: pain is certainly bad, but other things are worse.”

Book 2 rebuts the thesis that pain is bad (14); the speaker (anonymous but effectively Cicero; cf. **16A**) begins his case by citing philosophers who agree (15–18), hence all except Stoics and Pyrrho.

21 Pomponius Porphyrio, *Commentary on Horace's Epistles* 1.6.65

“If, as Mimnermus maintains”:¹ Mimnermus was a writer of elegies.² In some poem, while recommending the view of Hier-

mendans, qui summum bonum indolentiam <ait>, quam Graeci ἀπονίαν nominant, molestias amoris plus incommodi quam gaudii habere demonstrat.

5

1 sine amore iocisque / nil est iucundum, vivas in amore iocisque *pergit*
Hor., cf. Mimnermus F 1 West 1–2 *cf. [Acro] Sch. Ep. 1.6.65: poeta*
Epicureus 2 Hieronymi: Epicuri *[Acro] recc.* 4 ἀπονίαν :
 ἀναληγσίαν *edd.*

[M = Monacensis 181, s. x] 2 in quadam: quidam *edd.*: in prima
 iam *coni. Meyer crucem ante in indicans: qui in quadam coni.*
Hirschfelder: in qua iam Petschenig, in ... nominant (2–4) ad
hypothesin 1.6 transponens commendans: commendat *Petschenig*
 3 ait *add. edd., Koenighoff* 4 Graece ... nominat *coni. Hirschfelder*
 molestias *del. Petschenig* amoris: amores *edd.*

22 Cicero, *Tusculanae disputationes* 5.118–19 (BT t. 44 p. 457.13–458.5 Pohlenz)

10e W mihi quidem in vita servanda videtur illa lex quae in
 Graecorum conviviis optinetur: “aut bibat” inquit “aut
 abeat.” et recte; aut enim fruatur aliquis pariter cum aliis
 voluptate potandi aut, ne sobrius in violentiam vinolen-
 torum incidat, ante discedat. sic iniurias fortunae quas 5
 ferre nequeas defugiendo relinquo. haec eadem quae Epi-
 119 curus totidem verbis dicit Hieronymus. quodsi hi philoso-
 phi quorum ea sententia est ut virtus per se ipsa nihil valeat,
 omneque quod honestum nos et laudabile esse dicamus, id
 illi cassum quiddam et inani vocis sono decoratum esse 10
 dicant, ei tamen semper beatum censent esse sapientem,
 quid tandem a Socrate et Platone profectis philosophis fa-
 ciendum videtur?

1–7 *Epicurus F 499 Usener* 7–11 *Epicurus F 511b Usener*

[GKRV cum fragmento F] 5 discedat *FR²V² recc.*: *KH:*
dicebat GRV 7–8 hi vel ii philosophi *recc.* *V²: his philosophis codd.: is philosophis Pohlenz* 9 omneque *recc.*: omnesque *codd.* dicamus
codd.: dicimus recc. 11 ei *Wesenberg: et GKRV: id F: si i Pohlenz*
 12 profectis *G: perfectis KRH (evanida apud V)* 13 videtur *V²: vides*
GKRF: iudicas Seyffert

onymus, who says the greatest good is painlessness, which the Greeks call *aponia*, he shows³ that there is more trouble than joy in love's troubles.

From a third-century commentary on Horace; this comment glosses the final lines of a poem that praises equanimity and criticizes worldly pursuits (*nil admirari* is the *incipit*), including love.

¹ Horace continues (before concluding in 67–8): “without love and laughter / nothing delights, may you live with love and laughter.”

² An early Greek poet (seventh-century BCE) who influenced Hellenistic and Roman elegy; Horace alludes to F 1 West.

³ Both context (in Horace and Porphyrio alike) and syntax favor Mimnermus as subject of “shows” (and adding *ait* in 21.3), not Hieronymus (without *ait* but anacolouthon); but pervasive textual corruption precludes certainty. In the latter case, Hieronymus objects to love as an obstacle to the good life; cf. Arrighetti 121, Dalfino 281.

22 Cicero, *Tusculan Discussions* 5.118–19

“In my opinion, at any rate, we should uphold that rule which holds in Greek banquets: ‘Either drink,’ it says, ‘or depart.’¹ And rightly so. For one should either enjoy the pleasure of drinking along with the others, or withdraw while sober before facing any violence from those who get drunk. Likewise, any undeserved misfortunes you cannot endure you should leave behind by escaping. The very same things that Epicurus says Hieronymus says in as 119 many words.² Now if these philosophers, who maintain that virtue itself has no inherent strength and that everything we say is honorable and praiseworthy is only hollow and decorated with the empty sound of a voice, well if they nonetheless count the wise person always happy, then what I ask do the philosophers inspired by Socrates and Plato think should be done?”³

From the end of Book 5 (cf. 16B); Cicero concludes his argument that virtue is sufficient for happiness.

¹ A proverbial custom cited in Epicurean arguments against fear of death; here it is supposed to justify suicide to escape extreme misfortune.

² Taken strictly, “the very same things” (*haec eadem*) ascribes a recommendation of suicide to Hieronymus; cf. Arrighetti 122, Dalfino 281. But “in as many words” (*totidem verbis*) suggests a broader point, that Hieronymus and Epicurus agree on the importance of avoiding suffering, as Cicero emphasizes in 17 earlier in Book 5 (cf. 17 n. 4, 18A–C).

³ An argument *a fortiori*; for the antecedent, see 17.

- 23 Plutarchus, *De stoicorum repugnantibus* 2 1033B–C (BT t. 6.2 p. 2.9–3.4 Pohlenz)

ἐπεὶ τοίνυν πολλὰ μὲν ὡς ἐν ὀλίγοις αὐτῷ Ζήνωνι,
 πολλὰ δὲ Κλεάνθει, πλείστα δὲ Χρυσίππῳ γεγραμμένα
 τυγχάνει περὶ πολιτείας καὶ τοῦ ἄρχεσθαι καὶ ἄρχειν
 καὶ δικάζειν καὶ ῥητορεύειν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς βίοις οὐδενὸς
 ἔστιν εὐρεῖν οὐ στρατηγίαν, οὐ νομοθεσίαν, οὐ πάροδον 5
 C εἰς βουλὴν, οὐ συνηγορίαν ἐπὶ δικαστῶν, οὐ στρατείαν
 ὑπὲρ πατρίδος, οὐ πρεσβείαν, οὐκ ἐπίδοσιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ
 ξένης ὥσπερ τινὸς λωτοῦ γευσάμενοι σχολῆς τὸν πάντα
 βίον οὐ βραχὺν ἀλλὰ παμμήκη γενόμενον διήγαγον ἐν 10
 λόγοις καὶ βιβλίοις καὶ περιπάτοις, οὐκ ἄδηλον ὅτι τοῖς
 11W ὑφ' ἐτέρων γραφομένοις καὶ λεγομένοις μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς
 ὑφ' αὐτῶν ὁμολογουμένως ἔζησαν, ἦν Ἐπίκουρος ἡσυ-
 χίαν ἐπαινεῖ καὶ Ἱερώνυμος, ἐν ταύτῃ τὸ παράπαν κατα-
 βιώσαντες. αὐτὸς γοῦν Χρύσιππος ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ Περὶ
 βίων οὐδὲν οἶεται τὸν σχολαστικὸν βίον τοῦ ἡδονικοῦ 15
 διαφέρειν.

1–12 Zeno Cit. F 27 SVF 1 1–4 Zeno Cit. F 262b SVF 1 12–13
 Epicurus F 426a Usener 14–16 Chrysipp. F 702 SVF 3

[Xδga] 1 ὀλίγοις Xgd: λόγοις α 2 γεγραμμένα om. Xg 12
 ὁμολογουμένως Turnebus: ὁμολογουμένοις codd. 14 ὁ ante
 Χρύσιππος gd

- 24 Philodemus, *Stoicorum historia* = *PHerc.* 1018 col. 48.1–3 Dorandi

18eW καὶ πέντε Πρὸς Ἱερῶ[νυ-
 μον, [ᾗ] καὶ φασι μὴ [κα-

23 Plutarch, *On Stoic Self-Contradictions* 2 1033B–C

Now it happens that much has been written briefly by Zeno himself, much by Cleanthes, and far more by Chrysippus about government, being ruled and ruling, rendering judgment, and public speaking;¹ and yet we find in their own lives no military command, C no legislation, no service on a council, no advocacy in court, no military service for their homeland, no diplomatic mission, no public donation. Rather, they lived abroad, and having tasted leisure like some sort of lotus, they spent their whole lives — which were not short but extremely long — on arguments, books, and discussions.² Hence it is not unevident that they lived consistently with the writings and claims of others rather than with their own, since they devoted their lives entirely to that quietude which Epicurus and Hieronymus praise.³ Chrysippus himself, at any rate, in the fourth book *On Lives* thinks the academic life differs not at all from the life of pleasure.⁴

From the beginning of a polemical essay on Stoic inconsistencies. Charges of hypocrisy, or conflict between theory and practice, were a staple of ancient polemics, and especially frequent against the Stoics. For Plutarch's misleading assimilation of Hieronymus and Epicurus, cf. 17 n. 4.

¹ Plutarch lists the three main roles in Greek government: executive, judicial, and legislative. Zeno wrote a *Republic* (or *Government*) and *On Law*, Cleanthes a *Statesman*, *On Laws*, *On Judging*, and *On Kingship*, and Chrysippus *On Government*, *On Law*, *On Judging*, *On Justice*, and *On Rhetoric*.

² These three leading Stoics were famously longlived; and Plutarch's allusion to the lotus-eaters (*Odyssey* 9.82–105) likens them to Epicurean hedonists (cf. Sch. *Od.* 9.5).

³ The mention of “quietude” (ἡσυχίαν), which has connotations of avoiding politics, is probably Plutarch's paraphrase; cf. 40.

⁴ For Stoic views on “live” or careers, see Chrysippus F 685–704 SVF 3.

24 Philodemus, *History of Stoics* (Herculaneum Papyrus 1018 col. 48, Dorandi)

... and five volumes *Against Hieronymus*, [which] they say are not

τ]ωρθῶσθαι.

1–3 *Zeno Tars. F 2 SVF 3*

1–2 *suppl. Comparetti* 2–3 *suppl. Crönert*: [Περὶ ἰ]π]οθέσεων von Arnim

De ira

Librum Περὶ ὀργῆς conscripsisse Hieronymum (ut Bion et posteriores nonnulli) vel Περὶ ἀοργησίας (ut Plutarchus) veri simile est; cf. Arrighetti 112 n. 4.

- 25** Plutarchus, *De cohibenda ira* 4 454E–F (BT t. 3 p. 161.22–162.13 Pohlenz)

καθάπερ οὖν τὴν φλόγα θριξὶ λαγῶαῖς ἀναπτομένην
καὶ θρυαλλίσιν καὶ συρφετῷ ῥάδιόν ἐστιν ἐπισχεῖν, ἐὰν
δ' ἐπιλάβηται τῶν στερεῶν καὶ βάθος ἐχόντων, ταχὺ δι-
έφθειρε καὶ συνεῖλεν

- ὑψηλὸν ἡβήσασα τεκτόνων πόνον, 5
ὥς φησιν Αἰσχύλος, οὕτως ὁ τῷ θυμῷ προσέχων ἐν ἀρχῇ
καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν ἔκ τινος λαλιᾶς καὶ βωμολοχίας συρφε-
τῶδους ὀρῶν καπνιῶντα καὶ διακαιόμενον οὐ μεγάλης
δεῖται πραγματείας, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις αὐτῷ τῷ σιωπῆσαι
F καὶ καταμελῆσαι κατέπαυσε. καὶ γὰρ τὸ πῦρ ὁ μὴ παρα- 10
σχὼν ὕλην ἔσβεσε, καὶ ὀργὴν ὁ μὴ θρέψας ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ
22 W μὴ φυσῆσας ἑαυτὸν ἐφυλάξατο καὶ καθεῖλεν. οὐκ ἤρεσ-
κεν οὖν μοι, καίπερ ἄλλα χρήσιμα λέγων καὶ παραινῶν,
ὁ Ἰερώνυμος, ἐν οἷς οὗ φησι γινομένης ἀλλὰ γεγενη-
μένης καὶ οὔσης αἴσθησιν ὀργῆς εἶναι διὰ τὸ τάχος. 15
οὐθὲν γὰρ οὕτω τῶν παθῶν συλλεγόμενον καὶ διακινού-
μενον ἔχει τὴν γένεσιν ἐμφανῇ καὶ τὴν αὐξήσιν.

1 θριξὶ λαγῶαῖς: cf. *Plut. Conj. praec.* 4 138F 2 ἐπισχεῖν: cf. **8**
no. 1a Περὶ ἐποχῆς 5 *Aesch. F 357 Radt* 14–15 cf. *Sen. De ira*
3.1.3 16–17 cf. *Sen. De ira* 1.1.5–7, 2.2–4, 3.10.1–3 (cf. *Plut.* 455C)

[CDGLMXYα] 5 ἡβήσασα *Salmasius*: ἡβάσασα *LGXYDMα*: εἰ-
κάσασα *C* 8 καπνιῶντα *LCGM²αX³*: καπνίοντα *XYM*: καπνίζ-
οντα *Y²D*: καπνεύοντα *G²* 9 αὐτῷ τῷ *LCGDMα*: αὐτῷ τὸ *X*: αὐτὸ
τὸ *Y* 12–13 ἤρεσκειν *GDY³*: ἤρκεσεν *cett.* 14 γινομένης *GX³Y³α*:
γενομένης *cett.*

revised.

End of a list of works by Zeno of Tarsus, Stoic scholar after Chrysippus in the late third century; the following lines list his colleagues and students. This Zeno wrote little (D.L. 7.35) but did address ethics (D.L. 7.84); Wehrli 32 conjectures that his work criticized Hieronymus for his ethical views.

On anger

That Hieronymus wrote a work *On Anger* (as did Bion and many later writers) or *On Controlling Anger* (as Plutarch did) is likely; cf. Arrighetti 112 n. 4.

25 Plutarch, *On Controlling Anger* 4 454E–F

Just as a flame ignited in rabbit fur, wicking, or rubbish is easy to suppress,¹ but if it catches hold of anything solid and substantial, it quickly destroys and consumes “with youthful vigor the lofty labors of builders,” as Aeschylus says, so too someone who attends to his temper at the start and sees when some gossip or crude insult makes it start to smoke and kindle does not need much effort and often stops his temper simply by keeping silent and ignoring it.² For one who gives no wood to a fire quenches it, and likewise one who does not feed anger initially or fan his ire protects himself and puts it out. So I do not agree with Hieronymus, though he has other useful remarks and advice, when he says that we perceive anger not while it is beginning but due to its speed only after it has begun and is already underway. For no other emotion, while it is gathering and getting underway, is so obvious in its beginning and growth.

From a dialogue on anger (Περὶ ἀοργησίας); a Roman friend of Plutarch’s, Gaius Minicius Fundanus, explains how he learned to tame his temper. Prevention is the first topic he covers (2–5). Though critical of Hieronymus’ account of incipient anger, he praises his treatment of other topics, which suggests that he (and presumably Plutarch) had read a work on the topic by Hieronymus (cf. **9, 10**). M. Pohlenz, *Hermes* 31 (1896) 321–38 argues that his work was a major source for the dialogue; but his influence was probably indirect; see Arrighetti 112–16. Aristotle discusses anger in detail (*EN* 4.5, 7.6, *Rhet.* 2.2–3), and many later works on anger are known, most notably by Posidonius and Philodemus; but if Hieronymus devoted a work to the topic (cf. Arrighetti 112 n. 4, Wehrli 34), he may have been the first to do so (unless Bion’s tract preceded). See S. White in

- 26 Plutarchus, *De cohibenda ira* 11–12 460B–D (BT t. 3 p. 176.4–177.4 Pohlenz)

καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς τοῦ λογισμοῦ κατεγνωκότες ἀτονίαν καὶ
μαλακίαν ἐν τῷ κολάζειν σπεύδομεν παρόντι τῷ θυμῷ
καθάπερ πνεύματι παραβόλως. τροφῇ μὲν γὰρ ὁ πεινῶν
κατὰ φύσιν χρήται, τιμωρία δ' ὁ μὴ πεινῶν μηδὲ διψῶν
αὐτῆς μηδ' ὥσπερ ὄψου πρὸς τὸ κολάσαι τοῦ θυμοῦ 5
δεόμενος, ἀλλ' ὅταν πορρωτάτω τοῦ ὀρέγεσθαι γένηται
προσάγων τὸν λογισμὸν ἀναγκαίως. οὐ γάρ, ὥς Ἀριστο-
C τέλης ἱστορεῖ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐν Τυρρηνίᾳ μαστιγοῦσθαι
τοὺς οἰκέτας πρὸς αὐλόν, οὕτω πρὸς ἡδονὴν δεῖ καθάπερ
ἀπολαύσματος ὀρέξει τῆς τιμωρίας ἐμφορεῖσθαι καὶ 10
χαίρειν κολάζοντας (κολάσαντας δὲ) μετανοεῖν, ὧν τὸ
μὲν θηριῶδες, τὸ δὲ γυναικῶδες· ἀλλὰ καὶ λύπης καὶ
ἡδονῆς χωρὶς ἐν τῷ τοῦ λογισμοῦ χρόνῳ τὴν δίκην κομίζ-
23 W εσθαι μὴ ὑπολείποντας τῷ θυμῷ πρόφασιν. αὕτη μὲν οὖν
ἴσως οὐκ ὀργῆς ἰατρεία φανεῖται, διάκρουσις δὲ καὶ 15
φυλακὴ τῶν ἐν ὀργῇ τινος ἀμαρτημάτων. καίτοι καὶ
σπληνὸς οἴδημα σύμπτωμα μὲν ἐστὶ πυρετοῦ, πραινό-
μενον δὲ κουφίζει τὸν πυρετόν, ὥς φησιν Ἱερώνυμος.
D ἀλλ' αὐτῆς γε τῆς ὀργῆς ἀναθεωρῶν τὴν γένεσιν ἄλλους
ὑπ' ἄλλων αἰτιῶν ἐμπίπτοντας εἰς αὐτὴν ἑώρων, οἷς 20
ἐπιεικῶς ἅπασιν δόξα τοῦ καταφρονεῖσθαι καὶ ἀμελεῖσ-
θαι παραγίνεται. διὸ καὶ τοῖς παραιτουμένοις ὀργὴν δεῖ
βοηθεῖν πορρωτάτω τὴν πρᾶξιν ὀλιγωρίας ἀπάγοντας
καὶ θρασύτητος, εἰς ἄγνοιαν ἢ ἀνάγκην ἢ πάθος ἢ

this volume.

1 “Suppress” translates a term related to the title *On Suspension* (8A no. 1a); the term used by Plutarch here suggests an alternative focus for that work: “on suppressing or suspending” anger rather than assent or belief (cf. 54 n.).

2 “Temper” translates θυμός, which Plutarch appears to use here in the narrow Stoic sense of “incipient anger” (D.L. 7.113 = SVF 3.396, cf. 3.395, 397–8), or perhaps in the broad Platonic sense of spirit or passion; cf. Philod. *On Anger* 43.41–46.16.

26 Plutarch, *On Controlling Anger* 11–12 460B–D

In fact, we too, holding reasoning in contempt for laxity and weakness in punishing, rush on in our present temper recklessly as in a storm. For it is natural to eat when you are hungry, but natural to impose a penalty when you are not hungry or thirsty for it, and when you do not need temper as a sauce, but only after you get far away from desiring it and apply your reasoning as necessary.

- C For we should not do as Aristotle reports they did in Etruria in his day, when they had house slaves whipped to the tune of a flute. We should not, as if desiring gratification, take our fill of punishment for pleasure and enjoy it at the time but regret it later; the former is bestial, the latter effeminate. We should rather impose the penalty without either pain or pleasure when reasoning is in control, leaving no provocation for our temper. Now this may appear to be not a remedy for anger but a delay and protection against making mistakes when angry. Yet, while swelling in the spleen is a concomitant of fever, calming the swelling also alleviates the fever, as
- D Hieronymus says.¹ But when I observed how anger begins, I saw different people succumbing to it for different reasons, though virtually everyone has a belief that they are held in contempt or disdain. Therefore, we should help even those who resist anger by distancing the act from any slight or arrogance, and by ascribing

δυστυχίαν τιθεμένους.

7–11 *Arist. F 608b* Rose, cf. *Ath. 12 518B* = *Alcimus F 5 FHG 4.296*, *Pollux 4.56* 11 μετανοεῖν : cf. *De sera num. 550E* 12–16 cf. *Sen. De ira 3.12.4* 16–18 cf. *Hippoc. De loc. hom. 24*, *De intern. aff. 30–4*, *De aff. 20* 17 σύμπτωμα : cf. *Sen. De ira 3.13.1–2* 21–2 cf. *Arist. Rhet. 2.2 1378a30–2* 22–5 cf. *Arist. Rhet. 2.3 1380a9–12*

3 γὰρ *DM*²α : οὖν *G* : om. *cett.* 8 κατ' αὐτὸν *LGM*α : κατὰ τὸν *CXY* : καταταυτὸν *D* 11 κολάσαντας δὲ *add. Amyot* : δὲ α^c : εἶτα *D* : καὶ κολάζοντας *G* : om. *cett.* 12 καὶ¹ om. *DM* 13–14 κομίζεσθαι *Reiske* : κολάζεσθαι *codd.* 14 ὑπολείποντας *Bernadakis* : ὑπολείποντος *D* : ὑπολείποντα *cett.* 24 ἄνοιαν *Reiske* : ἄνοιαν *codd.*

27 Seneca, *De ira* 1.19.1–4 (OCT p. 57.29–58.14 Reynolds)

- 19 habet, inquam, iracundia hoc mali: non vult regi. irascitur veritati ipsi, si contra voluntatem suam apparuit; cum clamore et tumultu et totius corporis iactatione quos
2 destinavit insequitur adiectis conviciis maledictisque. hoc non facit ratio; sed si ita opus est, silens quietaque totas 5
domus funditus tollit et familias rei publicae pestilentes cum coniugibus ac liberis perdit, tecta ipsa diruit et solo exaequat et inimica libertati nomina extirpat: hoc non frendens nec caput quassans nec quicquam indecorum iudici faciens, cuius tum maxime placidus esse debet et in 10
21 W 3 statu vultus cum magna pronuntiat. “quid opus est” inquit Hieronymus “cum velis caedere aliquem, tua prius labra mordere?” quid si ille vidisset desilientem de tribunali proconsulem et fasces lictori auferentem et suamet vesti-
4 menta scindentem, quia tardius scindebantur aliena? quid 15
opus est mensam evertere? quid pocula adfligere? quid se in columnas inpingere? quid capillos avellere, femur pectusque percutere? quantam iram putas — quae, quia in alium non tam cito quam vult erumpit, in se revertitur.

it to ignorance, compulsion, passion, or misfortune.²

From a discussion of punishment (11–12) later in the same dialogue; Plutarch, emphasizing how anger distorts our judgment, counsels delay and diversion. Arrighetti 114–16 credits Hieronymus with originating this indirect method of treating symptoms rather than causes; cf. Dalfino 282–4 and S. White in this volume.

¹ The spleen, which filters out impurities from the liver, may swell when the liver is enflamed; cf. Plato *Timaeus* 72C–D, Arist. *PA* 3.4, 3.7, Hippoc. *Places in Man* 24 (with E. Craik, *Hippocrates: Places in Man* [1999] 172–5), *Internal Affections* 30–4, *Affections* 20. Both organs process bile and are traditionally associated with anger.

² The focus on perceived “slights” and “contempt” is distinctly Aristotelian; cf. *Rhet.* 2.2 1378a30–2. By contrast, Stoic accounts specify believed “wrongs” (*SVF* 3.395–8, Sen. *On Anger* 2.1.3), and Epicureans “harm” (Philod. *On Anger* col. 40.32–42.20, 47.9–4, 49.27–50.8).

27 Seneca, *On Anger* 1.19.1–4

19 Anger, I say, has this defect: it does not want to be ruled. It gets angry at the truth itself if that appears to contradict what it wants. With noise and commotion and convulsion of the entire body it
2 chases those it has targeted by hurling insults and curses. Reason does not do this. Rather, if it must, it is quiet and calm when it removes whole households entirely and wipes out families that infect the state, wives, children, and all; it tears down and levels the very houses and eliminates names hostile to liberty. It does this without clenching its teeth or shaking its head or doing anything unbecoming a judge, whose face should be calmest and steadiest when he
3 delivers important judgments. “What help is it,” says Hieronymus, “when you want to strike someone, to bite your own lips first?”¹ What if he had seen a proconsul leaping off the tribunal, grabbing a lictor’s fasces, and ripping his own clothes because others were
4 too slow to tear theirs?² What help is it to knock over the table? To fling cups? To bang your fists against a column? To pull out your hair or strike your thigh or chest? So great, you think, is anger: since it cannot burst out against others as fast as it wishes, it turns against itself! Thus the angry are restrained by those around them,

tenentur itaque a proximis et rogantur ut sibi ipsi placentur. 20

12–13 labra mordere: cf. *Plut. De cohib.* 10 458D, *Hom. Od.* 1.381 = 18.410 = 20.268, *Eur. Bacch.* 621

[ARV] 2 voluntatem RV: voluptatem A 10 tum: tunc recc. 14
fascies R²V²: faces ARV 17 avellere A: evellere RV 18 quantam
cruc. indic. Reynolds: quam amentem *coni. Gertz*: quanti *coni.*
Barriera: quietem *Fettes*

De vino [Περὶ μέθης]

Librum Περὶ μέθης conscripsisse Hieronymum, ut ante Aristotelem (F 99–111 Rose), Theophrastus (F 569–79 FHS&G, cf. 436 no. 31), Chamaeleon (F 9–13 Wehrli) satis constat; cf. Fortenbaugh 324–35. Utrum dialogi forma usus sit Hieronymus an alio quodam genere non est diiudicandum.

- 28** Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.24 424E–25A (BT t. 2 p. 423.15–424.1 Kaibel)

- 28 W ὦνοχόουν τε παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις οἱ εὐγενέστατοι παῖ-
δες, ὥς ὁ τοῦ Μενελάου υἱός,
ὦνοχόει δ' υἱὸς Μενελάου κυδαλίμοιο.
καὶ Εὐριπίδης δ' ὁ ποιητὴς ἐν παισὶν ὦνοχόησε. Θεό-
φραστος γοῦν ἐν τῷ Περὶ μέθης φησί, “πυνθάνομαι δ’ 5
F ἔγωγε καὶ Εὐριπίδην τὸν ποιητὴν οἰνοχοεῖν Ἀθήνῃσι
τοῖς ὀρχησταῖς καλουμένοις. ὠρχοῦντο δὲ οὗτοι περὶ τὸν
τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος νεῶν τοῦ Δηλίου τῶν πρώτων ὄντες
Ἀθηναίων καὶ ἐνεδύοντο ἱμάτια τῶν Θηραϊκῶν. ὁ δὲ
Ἀπόλλων οὗτός ἐστιν ὃ τὰ Θαργήλια ἄγουσι, καὶ δια- 10
σώζεται Φλυῆσιν ἐν τῷ δαφνηφορείῳ γραφὴ περὶ τού-
των.” τὰ αὐτὰ ἱστορεῖ καὶ Ἱερώνυμος ὁ Ῥόδιος Ἀριστο-

and they are asked to make peace with themselves.

From a Stoic critique of favorable views about anger, including several Peripatetic claims (1.5-20); Seneca, who denies that anger is ever necessary or useful, here emphasizes that angry people hurt themselves. Although he ascribes only the first example to Hieronymus, others as well (some commonplace) may come from him too, albeit indirectly (cf. 25 n.); see Arrighetti 112-16, S. White in this volume.

1 Hieronymus highlights a behavioral “sympton” of anger (cf. 26), one traditionally seen as a reflex of restraint at an outbreak of anger (cf. 25).

2 More loosely: a provincial governor holding court leaps off his podium and grabs a bailiff’s staff. This distinctly Roman example follows a story in 1.18.3-6 about the rage of Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso, proconsul of Syria in 17 CE. Seneca’s older brother Gallio, to whom the treatise is addressed, was proconsul of Achaia in 51-2 CE but known for his mild manner (Sen. *QN* 4a praef. 10, Stat. *Silvae* 2.7.31-2, cf. *Acts* 18.12-17).

On wine [*On Drunkenness*]

It is clear that Hieronymus wrote a work *On Drunkenness*, as did Aristotle (F 99-111 Rose), Theophrastus (F 569-79 FHS&G, cf. 436 n. 31), and Chamaeleon (F 9-13 Wehrli) before him; cf. Fortenbaugh 324-35. But whether Hieronymus or any of the others used the dialogue form or some other cannot be determined.

28 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 10.24 424E-F

“Among the ancients boys from the best families poured the wine, as Menelaos’ son did: ‘and the son of Menelaos poured F wine.’ Euripides the poet also poured wine as a boy. Theophrastus, at any rate, says in *On Drunkenness*, ‘I have myself learned that Euri-pides the poet also poured wine for the so-called Athenian “dancers”; they belonged to the first families of Athens and danced around the temple of Delian Apollo dressed in cloaks of the Theraici.¹ This is the Apollo for whom they celebrate the Thargelia, and a text about them is preserved in the temple of Laurel-bearing Apollo at Phlya.’² Hieronymus of Rhodes, a student of

425 τέλους ὧν μαθητής, καὶ οὗτος ἐν τῷ Περὶ μέθης.

1–13 *Theophr. F 576 FHS&G* 1–2 *cf. Ath. 5 192B* 3 *Hom. Od. 15.141* 8 τοῦ Δηλίου: *cf. τοῦ Ζωστηρίου, Vita Eur. 2.4–5 Schwarz*
9 Ἰθραικῶν: *cf. Pollux 4.118, 7.48, 7.77, Hesych. θ 523, Steph. Byz. s.v. Θήρα, Sch. Ar. Lys. 150, Suda α 1623, Et. Mag. 85.15*

[*A cum Epitome CE*] 8 πρώτων ὄντες *suppl. Valckenaer*: πρώτ<...>-
ντες *A* 9 τῶν Ἰθραικῶν *A*: Θήραια ἱμάτια *Hesych. γ 523, Pollux 7.48* 11 Φλυῆσιν *Valckenaer (cf. Suda φ 550 s.v. Φλυεῖα)*: φυλησι
A δαφνηφορεῖω *Kaibel*: δαφνηφορίω *A* 12–13 Ἀριστοτέλους:
Ἀριστοξένου *coni. Luzac*

29 *Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae 11.101 499E–500B (BT t. 3 p. 102.11–20, 103.11–13 Kaibel)*

τὸ δὲ σκύφος ὠνομάσθη ἀπὸ τῆς σκαφίδος. καὶ τοῦτο
δ' ἐστὶν ὁμοίως ἀγγεῖον ξύλινον στρογγύλον γάλα καὶ
F ὀρὸν δεχόμενον, ὡς καὶ παρ' Ὀμήρῳ λέγεται,

ναῖον δ' ὀρῷ ἄγγεα πάντα

γαυλοὶ τε σκαφίδες τε τετυγμένα, τοῖς ἐνάμελγεν. 5

27W εἰ μὴ σκύφος οἶον σκύθος τις διὰ τὸ τοὺς Σκύθας περαι-
τέρω τοῦ δέοντος μεθύσκεσθαι. Ἰερώνυμος δ' ὁ Ῥόδιος

500 ἐν τῷ Περὶ μέθης καὶ τὸ μεθύσαι σκυθίσαι φησί· συγ-

B γενὲς γὰρ εἶναι τὸ φ τῷ θ. . . . καλεῖται δ' ὁ σκύφος ὑπὸ
Ἰππειρωτῶν, ὡς φησι Σέλευκος, λυρτός, ὑπὸ δὲ Μηθυμ- 10
ναίων, ὡς Παρμένων φησὶν ἐν τῷ Περὶ διαλέκτου,
σκύθος.

4–5 *Hom. Od. 9.222–3* 6–8 *cf. 427A–C = Anacreon F 356 PMG, Hdt. 6.84, Chamaeleon F 10 Wehrli, Achaeus 20 F 9 TGrF* 6–7 *cf. [Arist.] Probl. 3.7* 10 *Seleucus F 47 Mueller* 11 *Parmenion RE 18.4 (1949) 1566 no. 4*

3 ὀρὸν *A*: ὀρρὸν *CE* 4 ναῖον *Aristarchus apud Sch. Od. 9.222, codd. Hom. nonnulli*: νέον *A*: νᾶον *vel* νάον *cett. Hom.* 10 λυρτός *A*:
γυρτός *Hesych. γ 1029 s.v.* 11 Παρμένων *A*: Παρμενίων *Sch. Il. 1.591*

425 Aristotle's, also reports the same, also in his *On Drunkenness*.”³

From a short speech by Ulpian (422E–426B) which marks a transition from dinner to drinking; these two examples are the first in a series meant to show that serving wine was traditionally a privilege reserved for elite youths (424E–425F, cf. 192B–C); cf. J. Bremmer, “Adolescents, *Symposion*, and Pederasty,” in *Symptica*, ed. O. Murray (1990) 135–48. For Theophrastus' work, see Fortenbaugh 330; cf. **30** for another parallel with his work (probably also from *On Drunkenness*: **30** n.), and **53A–B** and **58A** for the use of documents and inscriptions. Cf. **33–4** and **42A–C** on Euripides.

¹ Or “Theran cloaks”: in the “Thera” or “hunter's” style; worn in ritual dances, they were probably either embroidered capes or animal skins.

² Probably an inscription recording either the group's regulations (Wehrli 36) or its victories in festival contests. The Thargelia was a Spring festival, Phlya an Attic deme and ancestral home of Euripides (Suda φ 550 s.v.); on the problem of identifying the festival and its site, see Hiller 92, Wehrli 36.

³ Hieronymus was Aristotle's “student” only in the loose sense of being an Aristotelian or Peripatetic.

29 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 11.101 499E–500B

“The *skyphos* is named after the *skaphis* [pail]. This too is like-
F wise a round wooden vessel for holding milk and whey, as is said
even in Homer: ‘flowing with whey were all the handmade buck-
ets and pans and pails [*skaphides*], with which he did the milking’
— unless a *skyphos* is like a kind of *skythos*, because the Scythians
drink more wine than one should. Hieronymus of Rhodes, in *On*
500 *Drunkenness*, says ‘to act Scythian’ is also ‘to get drunk’; for the
B *phi* is closely related to the *theta*.¹ ... ² The *skyphos* is called a
lyrtos, as Seleucus says, by people of Epirus, but a *skythos*, as
Parmenio says in *On Dialect*, by people of Methymna.”³

From a long discourse on drinking vessels (461E–503F) which occupies most of Book 11; remarks on *skyphoi* span 498A–500C. The *skyphos*, a relatively deep drinking cup like a mug, is associated with heavy drinking; cf. J. Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes* (1997) 61–9. The nomadic Scythians, who made no wine of their own, were proverbially heavy drinkers; Hdt. 6.84 (followed by Chamaeleon F 10 Wehrli) traces the etymology to a Spartan explanation for their King Cleomenes (c. 519–490) going mad. Scythian customs also figure in 7.

¹ Both are aspirated, and as Hieronymus might have known, dentals often replace labials in Aeolic; cf. the case cited here from Parmenio, whose derivation Hiller 91 suggests is wrongly ascribed here to Hieronymus.

² Omitted is a list of three celebrated regional styles, including “Rhodiads”

- 30** Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.45 434F–35A (BT t. 2 p. 445.23–446.8 Kaibel)

εἰς τοσοῦτον δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐμέθυσεν, ὥς φησι Καρύ-
στιος ὁ Περγαμηνὸς ἐν Ἱστορικοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν, ὥς καὶ
ἐπὶ ὄνων ἄρματος κωμάζειν· ἐποίουν δὲ τοῦτο, φησί, καὶ
οἱ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεῖς· μήποτ' οὖν διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲ
πρὸς τὰ ἀφροδίσια εἶχεν ὁρμὴν· ἐξυδαροῦσθαι γάρ φη- 5
σιν ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τοῖς Φυσικοῖς προβλήμασι τῶν
38W 435 τοιούτων τὴν γονήν· Ἱερώνυμός τε ἐν ταῖς Ἐπιστολαῖς
Θεόφραστον φησι λέγειν ὅτι Ἀλέξανδρος οὐκ εὖ διέκει-
το πρὸς τὰ ἀφροδίσια. Ὀλυμπιάδος γοῦν καὶ παρανα-
κλινάσης αὐτῷ Καλλιξείναν τὴν Θετταλὴν ἐταίραν 10
περικαλλεστάτην οὔσαν, συνειδότος τοῦτο καὶ τοῦ Φιλ-
ίππου (εὐλαβοῦντο γὰρ μὴ γύννις εἶη), πολλάκις ἥτει
αὐτῇ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον συγγενέσθαι.

1–4 *Carystius F 4 FHG 4.357, cf. Ath. 434A–D, Ael. VH 3.23* 4–13
Theophr. F 578 FHS&G, cf. Plut. QC 1.6 623E, 3.5 652D 5–7
[*Arist.*] *Prob. 3.4, 3.11, 3.33* 7–13 *cf. Eustath. In Od. 11.224*

5 ἐξυδαροῦσθαι *CE*: ἐξυδροῦσθαι *A* 12 γύννις *Musurus*: γόνις
ACE

(500B), discussed also in Aristotle's *On Drunkenness* (F 110–11), and a pair of which Lyco bequeathes in his will (1.94 SFOD).

³ Seleucus “the Homerist,” a prolific Alexandrian scholar active in the early first century CE; Parmenio, a poorly attested scholar, was probably cited by Seleucus.

30 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 10.45 434F–435A

“Alexander used to drink so much, according to Carystius of Pergamon in his *Historical Notes*, that he would even have parties on a donkey-cart.¹ The Persian kings, he says, used to do this too. Perhaps, then, this is why he had no drive for sexual intercourse. For Aristotle says in the *Physical Problems* that people like this [sc. 435 heavy-drinkers] have watery semen; and Hieronymus in his *Letters* states that Theophrastus says Alexander was not in good condition for sexual intercourse.² At any rate, Olympias even had the Thessalian Callixeina, an extremely beautiful courtesane, lie beside him on his couch; Philip was fully aware of this, since they were taking precautions against their son being effeminate, and she often asked Alexander to lie with her.”³

From a discussion of wine-drinking which occupies most of Book 10; here the philosopher Democritus (426C–443C) recounts stories of heavy drinking by Alexander (434A–435A) and his father Philip (435A–D). The report about Alexander's impotence, here ascribed to Hieronymus' *Letters* (so word-order favors, contra Wehrli 40), comes from Theophrastus, probably his work *On Drunkenness* (cited by title only in Athenaeus: F 569–76 FHS&G; cf. Ath. 429B = F 579B without title); see Fortenbaugh 333. For similar borrowing, see **28** from Theophrastus, **47** and **53A–C** from Aristotle. Collected letters are attested also for Aristotle (F 651–70 Rose), Theophrastus (727 no. 15–16 FHS&G, cf. F 157, 374, 588), Demetrius of Phalerum (F 149 SOD), Dicaearchus (F 11B Mirhady), and Strato (F 150 Wehrli).

¹ Carystius, a late second-century BC scholar and historian: *RE* 10 (1919) 2254.

² Plut. *QC* 1.6 (623E–F) and *Alexander* 4.5, citing Theophrastus (*CP* 6.14.9), explains: Alexander had a very hot temperament, which made him exceptionally thirsty, and his resultant drinking diluted his semen and sexual drive; cf. ps.-Arist. *Problems* 3.4, 11, 33, and R. Sharples in *Aristo of Ceos*. Cf. **10** for related physiological explanations.

³ This report probably does not come from Hieronymus; “at any rate” often marks a change of source in Ath.

De disciplina

Librum conscripsisse Hieronymum *Περὶ παίδων ἀγωγῆς* vel *Περὶ παιδείας*, quae inscriptiones inter libros Aristotelis (F 62–3 Rose), Theophrasti (436 no. 9–11, F 465–74 FHS&G), Clearchi (F 13–15 Wehrli) traduntur, haud improbabile est.

31 Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 2.31.121 (t. 2 p. 233.1–16 Wachsmuth)

19 W Ἱερωνύμου

δεῦρο δὴ καὶ σκεψώμεθα περὶ τῆς τῶν παίδων ἀγωγῆς, τίνα τρόπον διειλήφασιν οἱ πατέρες· οὐ γὰρ μόνον ἐν τοῖς πρότερον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τούτοις εὐρήσομεν αὐτοὺς οὐ μικρὰ διαφωνοῦντας· οἵτινες πρῶτον μὲν βαρβάροις 5 παραβάλλοντες παιδαγωγοῖς καὶ τούτων ἀκούειν κελεύσαντες, ἱκανῶς ἐπιμελεῖσθαι νομίζουσιν, ὥσπερ τοῦ κατὰ πόδας ἀκολουθήσοντος, ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦ καλῶς ἡγησομένου δεομένων τῶν παίδων καὶ τοῦ φυλάττοντος καθάπερ 10 συβώτου μὴ πλανηθῇ, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ (. . .) διὸ καὶ τὸν ἐκ τῶν ἐργατῶν ἀποδοκιμασθέντα, τοῦτον ἐπὶ παιδαγωγίᾳ κατατάττουσι, τὰ φύσει τιμιώτατα τοῖς εὐτελεστάτοις διδόντες· ὅθεν καὶ Περικλῆς, οἰκέτου ποτὲ πεσόντος ἀπὸ ἐλαίας καὶ τὸ σκέλος συντρίψαντος, “νέος ἄρα,” ἔφη, “παιδαγωγὸς πέφηνεν,” οὐκ ἀπιθάνως τῆς ὑπουργίας τὴν 15 ἀτιμίαν σκώψας.

1 cf. *Phot. Bibl. Cod.* 167 114b3 3–10 cf. *Plut. De lib. educ.* 4A–B
13–16 cf. *Plat. Alcib. I* 122B

[L = *Laurentianus* 8.22, s. xiv] 5 post διαφωνοῦντας lac. *coni.*
Meineke 6 παραβάλλοντες: παραβαλόντες *Wachsmuth* παι-
δαγωγοῖς: τοὺς παῖδας παιδαγωγοῖς *Wachsmuth*: τὰ παιδί' ἀγωγοῖς
Meineke 8 ἀκολουθήσοντος ... ἡγησομένου *Wyttenbach*: ἀκολου-
θήσαντος ... ἡγησάμενου L 9 παίδων: παιδίων *Meineke* (cf.
πλανηθῇ) φυλάττοντος: φυλάξοντος *Meineke* 10 post
συβώτου *coni.* τὰ συβόσια *Meineke* μὴ *Wyttenbach*: εἰ L post
οὐχὶ lac. *stat. Wyttenbach*, “forte τοῦ παραινοῦντος vel simile quid”
(hic explicit codicis L folium) 11 ἐργατῶν: ἔργων *Gaisford*
τοῦτον L²: τούτων L 12 τιμιώτατα *Meineke*: τιμιώτερα L 14
νέος ἄρα *Hermann*: νέε ὄρα L 15 πέφηνεν: πέφηνας *Wyttenbach*

On education

That Hieronymus wrote a work *On Raising Children* or *On Education*, which titles are attested for works by Aristotle (F 62–3 Rose), Theophrastus (436 no. 9–11, F 465–74 FHS&G), and Clearchus (F 13–15 Wehrli), is not unlikely.

31 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 2.31.121

By Hieronymus

Come, then, let us examine the way fathers distribute the rearing of their children. For not only in the previous matters but also in these we shall find more than a little inconsistency. They first turn their children over to barbarian attendants and order the children to listen to these;¹ this they consider adequate supervision, as if children need someone who will follow behind them but not one who will guide them honorably and like a swineherd guard against them going astray, but not <...>. This is why some fathers even assign a slave deemed unfit for labor to attend their children, thus giving the tasks by nature most valuable to those least worthy. Hence, even Pericles said, when a slave fell from an olive tree and broke a leg, “So there’s a new attendant for the children.”² His joke about the disrespect for this task is not unconvincing.

From a set of excerpts on education (2.31 *Περὶ ἀγωγῆς καὶ παιδείας*); this is the only excerpt in Stobaeus explicitly ascribed to Hieronymus. His criticism of the custom of entrusting school boys to slave “pedagogues” (literally “child-leaders”) reflects a gradual development in their role from supervision to instruction, and growing interest in a “liberal” education befitting future citizens.

¹ Pointed irony: since “barbarian” slaves typically spoke little or poor Greek, “listening” to them was rarely instructive; they also tended to rely mainly on physical compulsion, as the mention of swineherders suggests.

² For another anecdote involving Pericles, see 49.

- 32** Plutarchus, *De recta ratione audiendi* 18 48A–B (BT t. 1 p. 96.3–15 Paton)

20 W ἕτεροι δὲ προσοχῆς καὶ δριμύτητος ἐν οὐ δέοντι θηρώ-
μενοι δόξαν ἀποκναίουσι λαλιᾷ καὶ περιεργία τοὺς λέγ-
οντας, αἰεὶ τι προσδιαποροῦντες τῶν οὐκ ἀναγκαίων καὶ
ζητοῦντες ἀποδείξεις τῶν οὐ δεομένων·
οὕτως ὁδὸς βραχεῖα γίγνεται μακρά, 5
ὥς φησι Σοφοκλῆς, οὐκ αὐτοῖς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς
ἄλλοις. ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι γὰρ ἐκάστοτε κεναῖς καὶ
B περιτταῖς ἐρωτήσεσι τοῦ διδάσκοντος, ὥσπερ ἐν συν-
οδίᾳ, τὸ ἐνδελεχὲς ἐμποδίζουσι τῆς μαθήσεως, ἐπιστά-
σεις καὶ διατριβάς λαμβανούσης. οὗτοι μὲν οὖν κατὰ 10
τὸν Ἱερώνυμον ὥσπερ οἱ δειλοὶ καὶ γλίσχροι σκύλακες
τὰ δέρματα δάκνοντες οἴκοι καὶ τὰ τίλματα τίλλοντες
τῶν θηρίων αὐτῶν οὐχ ἄπτονται.

5 *Soph. Ant.* 232 11 σκύλακες: cf. *Plat. Resp.* 7 539B, *Plut. De prof. virt.* 7 78E; cf. *Philod. Acad. hist.* 14.3–15 = *Polemo F 100 Gigante*, *D.L.* 4.18–19 = *Polemo F 101 (de catulis cf. Philod. Acad. hist. 13.20–7 = Polemo F 107, D.L. 4.17 = Polemo F 108)*

[ACDGMNWXYZ] 7 ἐκάστοτε C²GXDZMNWYA: ἕκαστοι C 8
τοῦ CDZM²A: τοῦ δὲ M. cett. 11 γλίσχροι: λίχνοι Wytttenbach

De amore

Hunc locum a Peripateticis veteribus tractatum in libris aut
Περὶ ἔρωτος (Aristoteles F 95–8 Rose) inscriptis aut
Ἐρωτικός vel Ἐρωτικοί (cf. Clearchus F 9–13 Wehrli,
Demetrius Phalereus 81 no. 7 SOD, Heraclides Ponticus F
64–6 Wehrli, Theophrastus F 557–68 FHS&G, cf. 436 no.
29–30), Hieronymus iterum tractavit, fortasse in libro ad id
ipsum dedito; cf. Fortenbaugh 324–35.

- 33** Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.5 557E (BT t. 3 p. 229.22–7 Kaibel)

36 W φιλογύνης δ' ἦν καὶ Εὐριπίδης ὁ ποιητής. Ἱερώνυμος
γοῦν ἐν Ἱστορικοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν φησιν οὕτως, εἰπόντος
Σοφοκλεῖ τινος ὅτι μισογύνης ἐστὶν Εὐριπίδης, “ἐν γε

32 Plutarch, *On Listening* 18 48A–B

Others, hunting after a reputation for acuity and ingenuity in the wrong place, belabor speakers with trivial and irrelevant points by always raising unnecessary difficulties and asking for proofs of things that need none. “This way a short path grows long,” as Sophocles says,¹ not for them alone but for everyone else as well. For by constantly interrupting the teacher with their empty and
B superfluous questions, as if they were on a tour, they interfere with the continuity of the lecture, which takes on pauses and digressions. These students, then, are like cowardly and clinging puppies, according to Hieronymus, which nip your skin and pull your hair around the house but never get hold of any animals on a hunt.²

From the conclusion of an essay on how to be a good listener. Addressing a youth c. 18 years old (37C), Plutarch focuses mainly on how to listen to philosophical lectures; here, after faulting some students for being diffident, conceited, or lazy (47C–48A), he criticizes pretentious know-it-alls (cf. 42F–43B). Arrighetti 116–20, comparing **4** and **54**, suspects criticism of Arcesilaus and Academic scepticism; but the context suggests the broader themes of diligence and respect.

¹ Soph. *Antigone* 232, perhaps quoted already by Hieronymus.

² Hieronymus borrows an analogy from Plato, *Rep.* 7 539B; similar sentiments are ascribed to the Academic Polemo (F 100–1).

On love

This topic, which earlier Peripatetics addressed in works entitled either *On Love* (cf. Aristotle F 95–8 Rose) or *Discourses on Love* (cf. Clearchus F 9–13 Wehrli, Demetrius of Phalerum 81 no. 7 SOD, Heraclides Ponticus F 64–6 Wehrli, Theophrastus F 557–68 FHS&G, cf. 436 no. 29–30), Hieronymus addressed too, perhaps in a monograph; cf. Fortenbaugh 324–35.

33 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 13.5 557E

“Also fond of women was Euripides the poet. Hieronymus, at any rate, in his *Historical Notes*, says the following: ‘When someone said to Sophocles that Euripides hates women, Sophocles said,

ταῖς τραγωδίαις,” ἔφη ὁ Σοφοκλῆς, “ἐπεὶ ἔν γε τῇ κλίνῃ
φιλογύνης.”

5

= *Soph. T 58a Radt*; cf. *Stob. 3.6.18* ἐκ τῶν Σερήνου (3 285.1–2 Hense)
1 φιλογύνης: cf. *Ath. 13 603E* = **34.1** 3 μισογύνης: cf. *Satyrus Vita*
Eur. (POxy 1176) F 39 col. 10–12, Anon. Vita Eur. 5.4–14, 6.1–13
Schwartz, Gell. NA 15.20.6–7, Suda ε 3695 (s.v. Euripides), Sch. Eur.
Troad. 1057

34 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.81–2 603E, 604D–F (BT t. 3 p.
331.15–17, 333.9–34.2 Kaibel)

35 W φιλομεῖραξ δὲ ἦν ὁ Σοφοκλῆς, ὡς Εὐριπίδης φιλογύν-
ης. Ἴων γοῦν ὁ ποιητὴς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιγραφομέναις Ἐπιδη-
604D μίαις γράφει οὕτως . . . καὶ Ἱερώνυμος δ' ὁ Ῥόδιος ἐν
τοῖς Ἱστορικοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν φησιν ὅτι Σοφοκλῆς εὐ-
πρεπῇ παῖδα ἔξω τείχους ἀπήγαγε χρησόμενος αὐτῷ. ὁ 5
Ε μὲν οὖν παῖς τὸ ἴδιον ἱμάτιον ἐπὶ τῇ πῶα ὑπέστρωσεν,
τὴν δὲ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους χλανίδα περιεβάλοντο. μετ' οὖν
τὴν ὁμιλίαν ὁ παῖς ἀρπάσας τὸ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους χλανίδ-
ιον ὄχετο, καταλιπὼν τῷ Σοφοκλεῖ τὸ παιδικὸν ἱμάτιον.
οἷα δὲ εἰκὸς διαλαληθέντος τοῦ συμβεβηκότος Εὐριπί- 10
δης πυθόμενος καὶ ἐπιτωθάζων τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ αὐτός
ποτε ἔφη τούτῳ κεχρησθαι τῷ παιδί, ἀλλὰ μηδὲν προσ-
θεῖναι, τὸν δὲ Σοφοκλέα διὰ τὴν ἀκολασίαν καταφρονη-
F θῆναι. καὶ ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ἀκούσας ἐποίησεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὸ
τοιοῦτον ἐπίγραμμα, χρησάμενος τῷ περὶ τοῦ Ἥλιου καὶ 15
Βορέου λόγῳ, καί τι πρὸς μοιχείαν αὐτοῦ παραινι-
τόμενος·

Ἥλιος ἦν, οὐ παῖς, Εὐριπίδη, ὅς με χλαιῖνων
γυμνὸν ἐποίησεν· σοὶ δὲ †φιλοῦντι ἐταίραν†
Βορρᾶς ὠμίλησε. σὺ δ' οὐ σοφός, ὅς τὸν Ἑρωτα

20

“Yes, in his tragedies, but he likes them in bed.” ’ ’

From Book 13 “On women” (so entitled in the primary manuscript); the host Larensis, after praising monogamy (and recounting **53B**), recounts some famous cases of polygyny, including Heracles, Theseus, Philip of Macedon, and finally Euripides. Euripides acquired a reputation for misogyny from contemporary comic lampoons of his heroines (cf. **53A** n.); see M. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (1981) 89–90, cf. J. March, “Euripides the Misogynist?” in *Euripides, Women, and Sexuality*, ed. A. Powell (1990) 32–75. Cf. **28** on Euripides, **34** and **43A–C** on Sophocles, and A. Podlecki, “The Peripatetics as Literary Critics,” *Phoenix* 23 (1969) 114–37.

34 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 13.81–2 603E, 604D–F

“Sophocles was fond of adolescent boys, as Euripides was of women.¹ Ion the poet, at any rate, in the work entitled *Visits* 604D *Abroad*, writes as follows² Hieronymus of Rhodes too, in his *Historical Notes*, says that Sophocles lured an attractive boy outside the city to have sex. The boy spread out his own cloak on the grass and they covered themselves with Sophocles’ cape. After their encounter, the boy took Sophocles’ tunic and went away but left his boy’s cloak for Sophocles. As one might expect, word of what happened spread widely, and when Euripides heard about it, he derided him, saying that he too once had sex with this boy but gave him nothing, whereas Sophocles was humiliated because of F his unrestraint. When Sophocles heard this, he composed the following epigram against Euripides, using the story about Helios and Boreas to allude to his adultery.

Helios it was, not a boy, Euripides, who stripped me
of my cape. But you in your love for a lady
Boreas enjoyed. And you’re not wise, who by sowing

ἄλλοτρίαν σπείρων λωποδύτην ἀπάγεις.

1–21 *Soph. T 75 Radt* 1–3 *Ion 392 F 6 FGh* 1 φιλογύνης: cf. *Ath. 13 557E = 33* 18–21 *Soph. F 4 West = F 3 Diehl*; “*ipsius esse Hieronymi suspicor*” *Nauck*

[A] 12–13 προσθεῖναι: πεπονθέναι *coni. Kaibel*: προεθῆναι *West* 13–14 καταφρονηθῆναι: ‘κατασοφισθῆναι *vel simile quid*’ *Meineke* 19 φιλοῦντι ἐταίραν: φιλοῦνθ’ ἐτέραν *Musurus*: φιλοῦντι κόρην *Herwerden*: φιλοῦντι, τάλαν *coni. West*

35 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.78 602A–D (BT t. 3 p. 327.16–329.2 *Kaibel*)

- 34W 602 Ἱερώνυμος δ’ ὁ Περιπατητικὸς περισπουδάστους
 φησὶν γενέσθαι τοὺς τῶν παίδων ἔρωτας, ὅτι πολλάκις ἡ
 τῶν νέων ἀκμὴ καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐταιρικὸν συμ-
 φρονῆσαν πολλὰς τυραννίδας καθεῖλεν. παιδικῶν γὰρ
 παρόντων ἐραστῆς πᾶν ὅτιοῦν ἔλοιτ’ ἂν παθεῖν ἢ δειλοῦ 5
 δόξαν ἀπενέγκασθαι παρὰ τοῖς παιδικοῖς. ἔργῳ γοῦν
 τοῦτο ἔδειξεν ὁ συνταχθεὶς Θήβησιν ὑπὸ Ἐπαμινώνδου
 ἱερὸς λόχος, καὶ ὁ κατὰ τῶν Πεισιστρατιδῶν θάνατος
 ὑπὸ Ἀρμοδίου καὶ Ἀριστογείτονος γενόμενος, περὶ
 Β Σικελίαν δ’ ἐν Ἀκράγαντι ὁ Χαρίτωνος καὶ Μελανίπου 10
 (ἔρωτος). Μελάνιππος δ’ ἦν τὰ παιδικά, ὥς φησιν Ἡρα-
 κλείδης ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἐρωτικῶν. οὗτοι φανέντες
 ἐπιβουλεύοντες Φαλάριδι καὶ βασανιζόμενοι, ἀναγ-
 καζόμενοί τε λέγειν τοὺς συνειδότες οὐ μόνον οὐ
 κατεῖπον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν Φάλαριν αὐτὸν εἰς ἔλεον τῶν 15
 βασάνων ἤγαγον, ὥς ἀπολῦσαι αὐτοὺς πολλὰ ἐπαινέ-
 σαντα. διὸ καὶ ὁ Ἀπόλλων ἦσθεις ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀναβολὴν
 τοῦ θανάτου τῷ Φαλάριδι ἐχαρίσατο, τοῦτο ἐμφήνας
 τοῖς πυνθανομένοις τῆς Πυθίας ὅπως αὐτῷ ἐπιθῶνται.
 C ἔχρησεν δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀμφὶ τὸν Χαρίτωνα, προτάξας 20
 τοῦ ἑξαμέτρου τὸ πεντάμετρον, καθάπερ ὕστερον καὶ
 Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ἐποίησε ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Χαλκοῦς ἐν
 τοῖς Ἑλεγείοις. ἐστὶν δὲ ὁ χρησμός ὁδε·
 εὐδαίμων Χαρίτων καὶ Μελάνιππος ἔφυν,
 θείας ἀγῆτηρες ἐφαμερίοις φιλότατος. 25

another's wife make Love a purloiner."³

From Book 13 "On women" (cf. 33); the speaker is Myrtilus, whose long catalogue of love affairs (571A–610B) occupies most of Book 13. Most of his examples are heterosexual, but a poem by Pindar prompts a digression on pederasty (601D–5A). Cf. 33 and 43.

¹ Cf. 33.

² A long excerpt from Ion on how Sophocles once stole a kiss from a young wine-pourer (cf. 28)

³ The epigram parodies a fable about the sun and the northwind (Aesop *Fab.* 46 Perry) and also the Attic myth of Boreas abducting the nymph Oreithuia (sources in S. Kaempf-Dimitriadou, *LIMC* 3.1 [1986] 134).

35 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 13.78 602A–D

602 "Hieronymus the Peripatetic says that love for boys became highly valued because the prime of youth and mutual companionship conspired to overthrow many tyrannies. For in the presence of his boyfriend, a lover would take any risk at all to avoid giving his boyfriend the impression of being a coward. At any rate, this was shown in history by the "sacred troop" that Epaminondas organized at Thebes, by the tyrannicide accomplished by Harmodius and Aristogeiton under the Peisistratids, and in Sicily by the love B of Chariton and Melanippus in Acragas (Melanippus was the boyfriend, as Heracleides of Pontus says in *On Matters of Love*).¹ When they were discovered plotting against Phalaris, they were tortured to make them name their fellow conspirators; but not only did they not name anyone, they even induced Phalaris himself to take pity on their torture, and he released them with great praise. So Apollo too, who was pleased at this, granted Phalaris the favor of deferring his death by revealing this to those who asked the Pythia how they could attack Phalaris. He also gave a response to C Chariton's friends, putting the pentameter before the hexameter, just as Dionysius the Athenian, nicknamed 'Brazen,' later did in his *Elegies*.² This is the oracle:

Happy were Chariton and Melanippus,
Leaders in godly friendship for shortlived mortals.³

διαβόητα δ' ἐστὶν καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ Κρατίνῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ γε-
 νόμενα, ὃς μεῖράκιον (ῶν) εὐμορφον, Ἐπιμενίδου καθ-
 αίροντος τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἀνθρωπεύει αἵματι διὰ τινὰ μύση
 παλαιά, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Νεάνθης ὁ Κυζικηνὸς ἐν β' Περὶ
 D τελετῶν, ἐκὼν αὐτὸν ἐπέδωκεν ὁ Κρατίνος ὑπὲρ τῆς 30
 θρεψαμένης· ᾧ καὶ ἐπαπέθανεν ὁ ἐραστής Ἀριστό-
 δημος, λύσιν τ' ἔλαβε τὸ δεινόν. διὰ τοὺς τοιοῦτους οὖν
 ἔρωτας οἱ τύραννοι (πολέμιοι γὰρ αὐτοῖς αὐταὶ αἱ
 φιλῖαι) τὸ παράπαν ἐκώλυον τοὺς παιδικοὺς ἔρωτας,
 πανταχόθεν αὐτοὺς ἐκκόπτοντες. εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ καὶ τὰς 35
 παλαίστρας ὥσπερ ἀντιτειχίσματα ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀκροπόλ-
 εσιν ἐνεπίμπρασάν τε καὶ κατέσκαψαν, ὡς ἐποίησε
 Πολυκράτης ὁ Σαμίων τύραννος.

1–25 *Heraclid. Pont. F 65 Wehrli* 4–6 *cf. Plat. Symp. 178D, 179A, Xen. Symp. 8.32–3* 6–9 *cf. Ath. 13 561F–62A, Max. Tyrius 18.2*
 8–9 *cf. Plat. Symp. 182C, Xen. Symp. 8.34–5* 8–11 *cf. Plut. Amat. 16 760B–C* 9–25 *plenius Ael. VH 2.4, confuse Hyg. Fab. 257* 12
 Περὶ ἐρωτικῶν: Ἐρωτικός *D.L. 5.87 in librorum Heraclidis tabula*
 17–20 *cf. no. 495 Parke-Wormell* 19–22 *Dionys. Ath. T 1 West*
 24–5 *no. 327 Parke-Wormell, cf. Euseb. PE 5.35.2–3 = Oenomaëus F*
 12 *Hammerstaedt* 26–32 *Neanthes 84 F 16 FGh (cf. 603E–F =*
Polem. Perieg. F 53 Preller: τὰ περὶ Κρ. καὶ Ἀρ. πεπλάσθαι φησὶν),
cf. D.L. 1.110, Plut. Solon 12 = Epimenides 3 A 4b DK, Arist. Ath. Pol.
1 = Epimenides 3 A 4a DK

[A cum Epitome CE] 4 παιδικῶν *Schweighäuser: παίδων A* 11
 ἔρωτος *add. Schweighäuser* 20 ἔχρησεν δὲ *Wilamowitz: ἔχρησέν τε*
A 22 Χαλκοῦς *Musurus: Χαλκεὺς A* 24 ἔφυν *Hercher: ἔφυν A*
 27 ὦν *add. Dindorf: ὦν Schweighäuser* 30 ὁ Κρατίνος *del. Kaibel*

Also very famous is what happened to Cratinus the Athenian, a handsome adolescent at the time when Epimenides used human blood to purify Attica because of some ancient stain, as Neanthes D of Cyzicus reports in Book 2 *On Rites*.⁴ He voluntarily gave himself up to spare the woman who raised him; and his lover Aristodemus died with him, and the terrible stain was removed.

“So because of instances of love like these, tyrants tried to prevent lovers having boyfriends, since these friendships are hostile to tyrants, and they eradicated them everywhere. Some tyrants even burned down and tore up the wrestling halls, which they considered fortresses opposing their own acropolises, as did Polycrates the tyrant of Samos.”⁵

From a digression on pederasty (601D–5A; cf. 34) in Myrtilus’ discourse on women; after citing its legendary origins, he recounts some celebrated examples, starting here. This excerpt is unified by the topic of tyranny, and the first sentence calls for examples; but it is uncertain whether anything after the first two sentences comes from Hieronymus (“at any rate” in the third sentence is a common transitional marker in Athenaeus). Phaenias of Eresos addressed the same theme in his *Tyrants Killed in Revenge* (F 14–16 Wehrli, cf. F 11–13 *On the Tyrants in Sicily*). For background, see D. Leitaio, “The Legend of the Sacred Band,” in *The Sleep of Reason*, ed. M.C. Nussbaum and J. Sihvola (2002) 143–69; cf. M. Griffith, “‘Public’ and ‘Private’ in Early Greek Institutions of Education,” in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, ed. Y.L. Too (2001) 23–84, esp. 61–6.

¹ The three examples are in reverse chronological order: Thebes c. 378 when a Spartan occupation force was driven out (Plut. *Pelopidas* 16–19); Athens c. 514 when Hipparchus was murdered (Thuc. 6.54–9); and Acragas under the infamous tyrant Phalaris, c. 570–555. On the Phalaris episode, see Gottschalk, *Heracleides* 93, who compares the popular tale of the Pythagoreans Damon and Phintias (Iambl. *De Vita Pyth.* 234–6 = Aristox. F 31 Wehrli).

² Mid-fifth century poet, quoted once by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 3.2 1405a31–4).

³ The distich is quoted in reverse order by Ael. *VH* 2.4, who tells the tale more fully.

⁴ The Cretan seer Epimenides was summoned to purify Athens after Cylon’s failed coup (632), when his supporters were executed after seeking refuge at an altar on the acropolis; on this controversial episode, see P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian “Ath. Pol.”* (1981) 79–84. Neanthes, a contemporary of Hieronymus (cf. Ath. 603 E–F) and a chronicler of local legends and famous thinkers, discussed the origins of ritual practices in this lost work (F 14–16).

⁵ Polycrates (c. 570–522) ruled Samos from c. 550 to his death. For his efforts to suppress his aristocratic rivals, see G. Shipley, *A History of Samos 800–100 BC* (1987) 90–9; cf. Arist. *Pol.* 5.11 1313a34–b32, citing Polycrates at 1313b24–5. Wrestling grounds and gymnasias, where young and old socialized and exercised nude, fostered aristocratic solidarity and also pederasty; see K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (1978) 54–5.

36A Plutarchus, *Agésilas* 13.5–7 603B–C (BT t. 3.2 p. 233.12–234.3 Ziegler)

- 37 W τὰλλα μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἀκριβῆς καὶ νόμιμος, ἐν δὲ τοῖς φιλικοῖς πρόφασιν ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι τὸ λίαν δίκαιον. ἀναφέρεται γοῦν ἐπιστόλιον αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ἰδριέα τὸν Κᾶρα τοιοῦτο, “Νικίας εἰ μὲν μὴ ἀδικεῖ, ἄφες· εἰ δὲ ἀδικεῖ, ἀμὴν ἄφες· πάντως δὲ ἄφες.” ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῖς πλείστοις τοιοῦτος ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων ὁ Ἀγησίλαος· ἔστι δὲ ὅπου πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον ἐχρήτο τῷ καιρῷ μᾶλλον, ὥς ἐδήλωσεν, ἀναζυγῆς αὐτῷ θορυβωδεστέρας γενομένης, ἀσθενοῦντα καταλιπὼν τὸν ἐρώμενον. ἐκείνου γὰρ δεομένου καὶ καλοῦντος αὐτὸν ἀπιόντα, μεταστραφεὶς εἶπεν ὥς χαλεπὸν ἐλεεῖν ἅμα καὶ φρονεῖν. τοῦτ᾽ ἐν οὖν Ἰερώνυμος ὁ φιλόσοφος ἱστόρηκεν.

1–5 *Apophth. Lac.* 209E (Ages. no. 16) 2–5 *Praec. ger. reip.* 807F–808A 3–5 *Reg. et imp.* 191B (Ages. no. 8)

[GLNS] 1–2 *post* φιλικοῖς *add.* πράγμασιν *Apophth. Lac.* 2 *post* δίκαιον *add.* πρὸς αὐτοῦς *Apophth. Lac.* ἀναφέρεται: φέρεται Ziegler (cf. 209E, 807F) 3 *post* αὐτοῦ *add.* παραιτουμένου τινὰ τῶν φίλων *Apophth. Lac.*, *similiter Reg. et imp.* 4 μὴ: οὐ *Apophth. Lac.*, *Reg. et imp.*, *Praec. ger. reip.* ἀμὴν Ziegler: ἄμιν S: ἡμῖν GLN: ἐμοὶ *Apophth. Lac.*, *Reg. et imp.*, *Praec. ger. reip.* 7 μᾶλλον SL²: καὶ μᾶλλον GLN 10 μεταστραφεὶς S: ἐπιστραφεὶς GLN, S in *margin*e 11 φρονεῖν GLN: φιλεῖν SL² οὖν *om.* GLN

36B Plutarchus, *Apophthegmata Laconica* 209E–F (BT t. 2 p. 115.21–116.2 Nachstädt)

- * 17. ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῖς πλείστοις τοιοῦτος ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων ὁ Ἀγησίλαος· ἔστι δὲ ὅπου πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον ἐχρήτο τῷ καιρῷ μᾶλλον. ἀναζυγῆς γοῦν ποτε γενομένης θορυβωδεστέρας ἀσθενοῦντα καταλιπὼν τὸν ἐρώμενον, ἐκείνου

36A Plutarch, *Agésilao* 13.5–7 603B–C

For in other matters Agésilao was strict and law-abiding, but in matters of friendship, he considered excessive justice an excuse. At any rate, a letter of his to Hidreus the Carian is recorded: “If Nicias is not in the wrong, release him; and if he is in the wrong, release him for us. At all events, release him.”¹ In most cases, then, this is the way Agésilao acted for his friends. But sometimes in a crisis he took the more expedient course instead, as he made clear when, in the commotion of suddenly decamping, he left behind his beloved who was wounded; for when the fellow begged and cried out as he was leaving, he turned round and said, “It is hard to be compassionate and prudent at once.” This is reported by Hieronymus the philosopher.²

From Plutarch’s “Life” of the Spartan Agésilao II (444–360, King from 399), who presided over Sparta’s loss of supremacy in Greece. Plutarch interrupts his account (11–15) of the king’s unsuccessful campaign to free Ionia from Persian control (396–394) to illustrate a propensity to favoritism that marred his otherwise upright character. For most ancient writers, Agésilao was an exemplary leader; see P. Cartledge, *Agésilao and the Crisis of Sparta* (1987) 413–20. If this anecdote is indicative, Hieronymus also admired him. Wehrli 40 suggests the anecdote figured in a discussion of conflicting obligations to friends and country. On Plutarch’s sources for this Life (mainly Xenophon, but also Theophrastus, Dicaearchus, Callisthenes), see D. R. Shipley, *A Commentary on Plutarch’s Life of Agésilao* (1997) 46–55; cf. 188–95 on this passage.

¹ “Hidreus” is probably Idrieus, younger brother of Mausolus of Halicarnassus and satrap of Caria after him (351/0–344/3); see S. Hornblower, *Mausolus* (1982) 41–5. Nicias and the nature and date of his misadventure are unknown.

² The singular deictic pronoun τούτῳ indicates that only the second anecdote comes from Hieronymus; the first is included here only to provide context. For the important role of male homophilia in Spartan acculturation, see P. Cartledge, “The Politics of Spartan Pederasty,” *PCPS* 27 (1981) 17–36.

36B Plutarch, *Laconian Sayings* 209E–F

17. In most cases, then, this is the way Agésilao acted for his friends. But sometimes in a crisis he took the more expedient course instead. At any rate, one time in the commotion of suddenly decamping, he left behind his beloved who was wounded; and

δεομένου καὶ ἀνακαλοῦντος μετὰ δακρύων αὐτόν, ἀπο- 5
στραφεὶς εἶπεν “ὥς χαλεπὸν ἐστὶν ἐλεεῖν ἅμα καὶ
φρονεῖν.”

[GJa] 3 γοῦν Ga: οῦν J 5 ἀποστραφεὶς Nachstädt: μετα-
στραφεὶς codd. 6 post ἐλεεῖν add. ἡμᾶς J

36C Plutarchus, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* 191A (BT t.
2 p. 59.16–19 Nachstädt)

* 4. νυκτὸς δὲ μέλλων κατὰ τάχος ἀναζευγνύειν ἐκ τῆς
πολεμίας καὶ τὸν ἐρώμενον ὁρῶν ἀπολειπόμενον δι’
ἀσθένειαν καὶ δακρύοντα, χαλεπὸν εἶπεν ἅμα ἐλεεῖν
καὶ φρονεῖν.

[GJoα] 4 φρονεῖν oGJa²: φιλεῖν α

RHETORICA

De Isocrate

Librum quem de arte rhetorica Hieronymus conscripsit
Περὶ Ἰσοκράτους (cf. **38A** 16a12–13) inscriptum esse—
ut libri Hermippi (F 64–5, cf. 68a2, 70, 77 Wehrli) Diony-
siique Halicarnassensis—veri simile est, nisi forte Περὶ
τῶν Ἰσοκρατικῶν σχημάτων (cf. **39**).

37A Cicero, *Orator* 189–90 (BT t. 5 p. 65.2–20 Westman)

189 sed quaeritur quo numero aut quibus potissimum sit
utendum. incidere vero omnis in orationem etiam ex hoc
intellegi potest, quod versus saepe in oratione per impru-
dentiam dicimus. est id vehementer vitiosum; sed non
attendimus neque exaudimus nosmet ipsos. senarios vero 5

when the fellow begged and cried out to him in tears, he turned away and said, “It is hard to be compassionate and prudent at once.”

From an anthology of sayings of Spartan leaders, including 79 involving Agesilaos; as in **36A**, the Nicias anecdote precedes immediately (in virtually identical wording). Plutarch’s authorship of this work has been questioned; but see F. Fuhrmann, *Plutarque: Oeuvres morales* v. 3 (1988) 131-40. The anthology follows Plutarch’s *Life* closely (40 sayings appear in both, all but two in the same order) but includes additional sayings from other sources.

36C Plutarch, *Sayings of Kings and Generals* 191A

4. When he was about to decamp quickly from hostile territory and he saw his beloved crying at being left behind on account of his wounds, he said it’s hard to be compassionate and prudent at once.

From a collection of anecdotes about famous leaders, both Greek and non-Greek, arranged by region; this is the fourth of twelve about Agesilaos (the Nicias anecdote is paraphrased in no. 8). Plutarch’s authorship has been questioned, despite a dedicatory preface to Trajan; it is defended by F. Fuhrmann, *Plutarque: Oeuvres morales* v. 3 (1988) 3–15. The relationship between this work and Plutarch’s *Life* is unclear.

RHETORIC

On Isocrates

The work that Hieronymus wrote on rhetoric was most likely entitled *On Isocrates* (cf. **38A** 16a12–13), as were works by Hermippus (F 64–5, cf. 68a2, 70, 77 Wehrli) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, or perhaps *On the Isocratean Figures* (cf. **39**).

37A Cicero, *Orator* 189–90

189 But the question is which rhythm or rhythms it is best to use. That indeed all rhythms occur in speech can be grasped even from this, that we often utter entire verses in a speech inadvertently. This is a serious mistake; but we do not attend or listen to ourselves when we speak. Indeed, we can hardly avoid iambic trimeters and

et Hipponacteos effugere vix possumus; magnam enim
 partem ex iambis nostra constat oratio. sed tamen eos ver-
 51 W sus facile agnoscit auditor; sunt enim usitatissimi. incul-
 camus autem per imprudentiam saepe etiam minus usitados,
 sed tamen versus: vitiosum genus et longa animi provisione 10
 190 fugiendum. elegit ex multis Isocratis libris triginta fortasse
 versus Hieronymus Peripateticus in primis nobilis, pleros-
 que senarios sed etiam anapaesta; quo quid potest esse
 turpius? etsi in legendo fecit malitiose. prima enim syllaba
 dempta ex primo verbo sententiae postremum ad verbum 15
 primam rursus syllabam adiunxit insequentis sententiae: ita
 factus est anapaestus is qui Aristophaneus nominatur; quod
 ne accidat observari nec potest nec necesse est. sed tamen
 hic corrector in eo ipso loco quo reprehendit, ut a me
 animadversum est studiose inquirente in eum, immittit 20
 imprudens ipse senarium. sit igitur hoc cognitum, in solutis
 etiam verbis inesse numeros eosdemque esse oratorios qui
 sint poetici.

11–12 elegit ... versus: cf. *D.H. Isocr.* 13.6 = **38B**.24–5 13 ana-
 paesta: cf. *Demetr. Eloc.* 188

[A, FPO; L = consensus FPO] 4 est id vehementer A: quod
 vehementer est L 6 effugere APO: effugire F 8 agnoscit AF:
 cognoscit PO: ignoscit coni. Heerdegen auditor LA²: orator A
 enim: autem recc. 13 anapaesta L: anapesti A 14 in legendo AP:
 in eligendo FOP² 15 ex A: in L postremum L: postremo A 16
 insequentis L: insequentem A sententiae om. L ita A: itaque L
 19 reprehendit ut L: reprehenditur A 22 eosdemque AF: eos denique
 PO

Hipponacteans, since our speech consists largely of iambs.¹ Yet a listener easily notices these verses, since they are so widely used. However, we often inadvertently introduce less common verses as well, but verses nonetheless: this is a mistake and must be avoided 190 by looking far ahead. Hieronymus, one of the most admirable Peripatetics, picked out some thirty verses from Isocrates' many works, mostly iambic trimeters but also anapests.² What can be more offensive than that?³ And yet he was unfair in his selection. For he removed the first syllable from the first word in a sentence, then added to its last word the first syllable from the following sentence; and this produced the anapest called Aristophanean, which it is neither possible nor necessary to try to avoid.⁴ Yet this critic, in the very passage where he makes this complaint, as I found when I studied his work closely, himself inserts an iambic trimeter inadvertently. Be it therefore acknowledged that rhythms occur even in prose, and that the same ones are suited to oratory as are to poetry.

From a discussion of prose rhythm that forms the final third (*Or.* 168–238) of Cicero's defense of his oratorical practice and principles. While advocating the use of *clausulae* (short metrical phrases at the end of clauses), he objects to the use of longer metrical units (cf. *Arist. Rhet.* 3.8). The metrical labels mentioned here originated in the Lyceum and third-century Alexandria, but Cicero leaves it unclear whether Hieronymus used them himself.

¹ Iambic trimeter (or Latin *senarius*) is the standard meter for spoken verse in ancient drama; its basic structure of six iambs (three feet of two iambs each) admits extensive resolution and substitution, which can sound very much like prose. The Hipponactean (named after Hipponax, a sixth-century poet from Ephesus) substitutes a trochee for the final iamb, which produces a "limping" effect (whence the alternative label of "choliamb"); cf. *Demetr. Eloc.* 301 (on "fierce" style).

² The laudatory introduction of Hieronymus (cf. 11) softens the subsequent criticism, which is distinctly *ad hominem*. Cicero's claim to first-hand knowledge of Hieronymus' work is notable; but his brief discussions of delivery (*Or.* 54–60, cf. 38A–B) and figures of speech (*Or.* 163–7, cf. 38B.24–8) do not mention him.

³ "That" probably refers to using entire verses of any sort in prose, rather than anapests in particular. *Demetr. De Eloc.* 188 also objects to anapestic rhythms.

⁴ The Aristophanean (named after the Athenian comic poet) is an anapestic tetrameter catalectic, which is an unusually long verse (at least 15 syllables and often 20 or more). See J. Sandys, *Ciceronis Orator* (1885) for examples from *Panegyricus* 45 and 189.

Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

37B Rufinus, *De numeris oratorum* (GL t. 6 p. 573.22–5 Keil)

50W de compositione et numeris et pedibus oratorii, ut Cicerō dicit, isti scripserunt apud Graecos: Thrasymachus, Naucrates, Gorgias, Ephorus, Isocrates, Theodectes, Aristoteles, Theodorus Byzantius, Theophrastus, Hieronymus.

5

2–5 nomina e Cic. Orat. sumpta esse notat Keil ad 573.21 2
Thrasymachus: cf. 85 A 12 DK 3 Naucrates: cf. B 31 Radermacher
Gorgias: cf. 82 A 32 DK Ephorus 70 F 107 FGrH Theodectes:
cf. B 37 Radermacher 4 Aristoteles: cf. Rhet. 3.8 Theodorus F 16
B 12 Radermacher Theophrastus F 698 FHS&G

38A Philodemus, *De rhetorica* 4 = *PHerc.* 1007 col. 16a.5–18a.8 (BT t. 1 p. 197–200 Sudhaus)

16a5 οἱ
δ' οὖν πολλοὶ τ[ων] σοφιστῶν
ἐοίκασι[ν, ἐ]ξ ᾧ[ν γ]εγράφα-
51 W σιν, ἀθλίως ὑποκεκρίσ[θ]αι·
πονηρὸν γὰρ εἰ[ς] ὑπόκρι-
10 σιν αἱ μ[α]κραὶ περίοδοι, κα-
θάπερ καὶ παρὰ Δημητρί-
ωι κεῖται περὶ τῶ[ν Ἰ]σοκρά-
τους. Ἱερών[υμο]ς δέ φη-
σιν ἀναγνῶνα[ι μ]ὲν αὐ-
15 τοῦ τοὺς λόγου[ς] καλῶς
δυνήσεσθαι τιν[α], δη[μ]η-
γορῆσαι δὲ τήν τε φ[ω]νὴν
καὶ τὸν τόνον ἐπαίρον-
τα καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ κατ[α]-
20 σκευῇ[ι μετ]ᾶ τῆ[ς] ἀρμοττο[ύ]-
σης ὑποκρίσεως εἰπεῖν
οὐ παντελῶς· τὸ γὰρ μέ-
[γι]στον καὶ κεινητικῶ-
τατον παρεῖσθαι τῶν
25 ὄχλων· ἄψυχον γὰρ αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἀνυπάκο[υσ]τ[ο]ν εἶναι
17a τὴν λέξιν καὶ οἰονεῖ προ[ς] ἔ[ξ]να

37B Rufinus, *On Rhythm in Orators*

These Greeks, as Cicero says, have written on composition, rhythm, and meter in oratory: Thrasyarchus, Naucratus, Gorgias, Isocrates, Theodectes, Aristotle, Theodorus of Byzantium, Theophrastus, Hieronymus.

Rufinus of Antioch, a fifth-century Latin grammarian (no. 130 Kaster; cf. *RE* Suppl. 5 [1931] 842-3 no. 39), lists Greek authorities (mainly fourth-century BCE and mostly in chronological order) named in the discussion of prose rhythm in Cicero's *Orator*.

38A Philodemus, *On Rhetoric* 4 col. 16a5–18a8

In fact, to judge from their writings, most of the sophists were miserable at delivery. For long sentences make delivery difficult, just as Demetrius too says about Isocrates' works. Hieronymus says that his discourses are good for reading, but it absolutely impossible to declaim them as public orations in a rising voice and tone or to speak in this style with the requisite delivery. For he has dispensed with what is most important and most effective on a crowd: his style is unanimated, boring, and composed as if for a monotone; he has eliminated breaks, variety, and the partitioning

- τόνον πεποιημένην, τὸ δὲ
 κεκλασμένον καὶ παντο-
 दा[πὸ]ν καὶ ἐπιτάσει τε καὶ
 5 ἀνέσει καὶ ταῖς παθητικαῖς
 ὑπερθέ[σ]εσιν διειλ[ημ]μέ-
 νον ἀπο[β]εβληκέναι, τῇ [δ]ὲ
 λειότητι διὰ παντὸς
 δουλεύειν. τοιγα[ρο]ῦν ε[ὕ]-
 10 ανάγνωστον μὲν εἶναι [τ]ῆς
 φων[ῆς] ὑφειμένης, ἐπα[ρ]-
 θείσης δὲ αν ταῖς πε-
 ρι[ό]δ[ο]ις καὶ π[ν]εῖγουςαν τὸ[ν]
 λέγοντα· καὶ τὴν ὑπόκρι-
 15 σιν ἀφαιρου[μ]ένου, καὶ σχε-
 δὸν ἐναντίαν τῇ τῶν πο-
 λειτικῶν. [τὸ]ν δὲ πολειτευ-
 ομένων ἐπιστατήσοντα
 πολειτικὴν δεῖν καὶ δημη-
 20 γορικὴν κα[τα]κεχύσθαι
 λέξιν καὶ μὴ τὴν ἐπιδί-
 φριον καὶ καταψιθυρίζου-
 σαν τὸν λόγον. ὅμοιον
 γοῦν εἶναι τῷ δασὺ καὶ
 25 μέγα περιθέμενον πρό-
 σωπο[ν] παιδίου φωνὴν ἀ-
 φιέν[αι καὶ] τὸ τοῖς Ἑλ-
 18a λ[ησ]ιν συμβουλευόντα καὶ
 πλάσμα καὶ τὴν ἄλλην κα-
 τασκευὴν δημηγόρου πε-
 ριβαλλόμενον ἐπ' ἀ[ναγ]νώσ-
 5 του παιδὸς φωνὴν ἀπο-
 [δεδ]ρακέναι μήτε τόνον
 [μ]ήτε πάθος μήθ' ὑπόκρι-
 σιν δυναμένου φέρειν.

16a.5–18a.8 *Demetr. Phal. F 134 SOD* 16a.9–13 *Demetr. Phal. 228 F 14 FGrH* 10 μακρὰν περίοδον: cf. *Arist. Rhet. 3.9 1409b17–23*
 16a.13–17a.7 *D.H. Isocr. 13.3–4 = 38B.12–20* 18a.4–8 *D.H. Isocr. 13.5 = 38B.20–3* →

created by increasing and relaxing tension and by emotional crescendoes; and he is a slave to smoothness throughout. Therefore, he is easy to read in a relaxed voice, but in a raised <his style ...> by its rounded sentences and chokes the speaker; and by removing delivery, it is almost the opposite of the style required in politics. One who is going to manage political affairs should be steeped in a political and oratorical style, not a sedentary style that only whispers its speech. Indeed, he says, it is like someone putting on a big, bearded mask and then speaking in a child's voice, if you try to advise the Greeks and adopt the formal style and techniques of a public orator but then retreat to the voice of a boy reciter who is incapable of supplying any volume, emotion, or performance.¹

From a brief discussion of delivery (col. 11a–19a) in Philodemus' critique of rhetorical training and techniques. The preceding lines cite Demosthenes' interest in delivery (15a 3–6, cf. Cic. *Or.* 56), then report critical assessments of his delivery by Aeschines and Demetrius of Phalerum (F 134 SOD); the sequel criticizes current practice; cf. M. Gigante, "La Scuola di Aristotele," in *Beiträge zur antiken Philosophie*, ed. H.-C. Günther and A. Rengakos (1997) 255–70 at 260–3. For analysis, see D. Mirhady in this volume.

¹ "Boy" here may refer to a slave "reader" or simply to a child. The criticism is especially apt for Isocrates, whose infirmities obliged him to circulate his discourses as pamphlets rather than deliver them as speeches.

Post Sudhaus hunc locum inspexerunt edideruntque G. Indelli, CEr 23 (1993) 87–91, et T. Dorandi, Demetr. Phal. F 134 SOD, cui lectiones novas debeo.
 16a 15 καλῶς suppl. Spengel (cf. D.H. *Isocr.* 13.3 = **39B.13**) 26 ἀνυπά-
 κο[υσ]τ[ο]ν Scott 17a 12 : M (vel N?) E/O ΔΙ (vel ΛΙ, Ν, ΑΙ?) . P
ut videtur : μ[ή, λί]αν Sudhaus : μ[ή λί]αν, Indelli 13 καὶ π[ν]εῖγουςαν
Indelli : κα[τεπ]εῖ[γ]ουςαν Sudhaus 15 ἀφαιρου[μ]ένου Sudhaus : ἀφαιρ-
 ου[μ]ένην coni. Spengel cetera Spengel

38B Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *De Isocrate* 13 (CB t. 1 p. 130.7–131.15 Aujac)

- 13 οὗτος δὲ οὐκ ἔμὸς ὁ λόγος πρώτου μὰ Δία, ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ
καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν ταύτην εἶχον ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τὴν δόξαν.
- 2 Φιλόνικος μὲν γὰρ ὁ διαλεκτικὸς τὴν ἄλλην κατα-
σκευὴν τῆς λέξεως ἐπαινῶν τάνδρὸς μέμφεται τῆς κενό-
τητός τ' αὐτῆς καὶ τοῦ φορτικοῦ, εἰκέναι τέ φησιν αὐτὸν 5
ζωγράφῳ ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐσθῆσι καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς σχήμασι
πάσας ἐπικοσμοῦντι τὰς γραφάς· “ἅπαντας γοῦν εὕρις-
κον τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ τοῖς αὐτοῖς τρόποις τῆς λέξεως
κεχρημένους, ὥστ' ἐν πολλοῖς τεχνικῶς τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα
ἐξεργαζόμενον, τοῖς ὅλοις ἀπρεπῇ παντελῶς φαίνεσθαι 10
διὰ τὸ μὴ προσηκόντως τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις τῶν ἡθῶν
φράζειν.”
- 52bW 3 Ἱερώνυμος δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος φησιν ἀναγνῶναι μὲν ἄν
τινα δυνηθῆναι τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ καλῶς, δημηγορῆσαι
δὲ τὴν τε φωνὴν καὶ τὸν τόνον ἐπάροντα καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ 15
κατασκευῇ μετὰ τῆς ἀρμοττούσης ὑποκρίσεως εἰπεῖν οὐ
4 παντελῶς. τὸ γὰρ μέγιστον καὶ κινητικώτατον τῶν ὄχ-
λων παραιτεῖσθαι, τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ ἔμψυχον· δουλεύ-
ειν γὰρ αὐτὸν τῇ λειότητι διὰ παντός, τὸ δὲ κεκραμένον
καὶ παντοδαπὸν ἐπιτάσσει τε καὶ ἀνέσει καὶ τὸ ταῖς παθη- 20
5 τικαῖς ὑποθέσει διειλημμένον ὑπερβεβηκέναι. καθό-
λου δέ φησιν αὐτὸν εἰς ἀναγνώστου παιδὸς φωνὴν κατα-
δύντα μήτε τόνον μήτε πάθος μήτε ὑπόκρισιν δύνασθαι
φέρειν. πολλοῖς δὲ καὶ ἄλλοις ταῦτα καὶ παραπλήσια
6 τούτοις εἴρηται, περὶ ὧν οὐδὲν δέομαι γράφειν. ἐξ αὐτῆς 25
γὰρ ἔσται τῆς Ἰσοκράτους λέξεως τεθείσης καταφανὴς
ὅ τε τῶν περιόδων ῥυθμὸς ἐκ παντὸς διώκων τὸ γλαφυρὸν
καὶ τῶν σχημάτων τὸ μεираκιῶδες περὶ τὰς ἀντιθέσεις
7 καὶ παρισώσεις καὶ παρομοιώσεις κατατριβόμενον. καὶ 30
οὐ τὸ γένος μέφομαι τῶν σχημάτων (πολλοὶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς
ἐχρήσαντο καὶ συγγραφεῖς καὶ ῥήτορες, ἀνθίσαι βουλό-

38B Dionysius of Halicarnassis, *On Isocrates* 13

13 This claim is not mine originally, by Zeus, for many even from
 2 long ago had this opinion of Isocrates. Philonicus the logician
 praises the rest of the man's style but criticizes its emptiness and
 poor taste.¹ He says he is like a painter who depicts every figure in
 the same clothes and the same poses: "At any rate, I found the same
 stylistic devices used in all his discourses, so that while he often
 handles particular points skillfully, the overall impression is com-
 3 pletely inept because his phrasing does not suit the character of his
 subject." And Hieronymus the philosopher says that his discourses
 are good for reading, but it is absolutely impossible to declaim
 them as public orations in a raised tone and voice or to speak in this
 4 style with the requisite delivery. For he rejects what is most impor-
 tant and most effective on a crowd: all emotion and animation. For
 he is everywhere a slave to smoothness; and he has avoided the
 blending and variety achieved by increasing and relaxing tension,
 5 and also the partitioning created by emotional issues.² In general,
 he says, Isocrates adopted the voice of a child reciter who is inca-
 pable of supplying any volume, emotion, or delivery.

Many others have said these and very similar things, which I do
 6 not need to record. For an example of Isocrates' style will make
 obvious both his constant pursuit of polish in the rhythm of his
 sentences, and his juvenile reliance on figures like antithesis, par-
 7 allelism, and assonance.³ And it is not the kind of figures that I
 criticize, since many writers and orators used them when they want

μενοι τὴν λέξιν) ἀλλὰ τὸν πλεονασμόν.

1 *Eur. F 484 TGF*, cf. *D.H. Dem. 5.6* 3–12 *Philonicus ignotus*
13–21 *Philod. Rhet. 4 = 38A col. 16a.13–17a9* 13–17 cf. *D.H.*
Isocr. 2.5–6 21–4 *Philod. Rhet. 4 = 38A col. 18a.4–8* 25–6 ἐξ
αὐτῆς . . . τῆς Ἰσοκράτους λέξεως τεθείσης: cf. *Cic. Orat. 190 =*
38A.11–12 26–8 cf. *D.H. Isocr. 2.7, 12.3*

[*F, VATB; Z = consensus VATB*] 4 κενότητος *TB*: καινότητος *FAV*
5 αὐτὸν *FVAB*: αὐτῷ *T* 6 ἐσθῆσι *edd.*: ἐσθήσεσι *Z*: αἰσθήσεσι
F 9 τὰ *om. F* 10 ὅλοις *ed. Aldina*: ὀλίγοις *Z*: λόγοις *F* 14
δυνηθῆναι: δυνήσεσθαι *PHerc* 15 τε *om. F* ἐπάραντα:
ἐπαίροντα *PHerc* 18 παραιτεῖσθαι: παρεῖσθαι *PHerc* 19 δὲ *om.*
F κεκραμένον: κεκλασμένον *PHerc* 21 ὑποθέσει: ὑπερθέσει
PHerc ὑπερβεβηκέναι: ἀποβεβληκέναι *PHerc* 26 ἔσται *om. F*

39 *Suda* κ 1778 s.v. Κλήμης (t. 3 p. 132.28–9 Adler)

- * Κλήμης – ιστορικός, ἔγραψε Ῥωμαίων βασιλεῖς καὶ
αὐτοκράτορας, καὶ Πρὸς Ἱερώνυμον Περὶ τῶν Ἰσο-
κρατικῶν σχημάτων, καὶ ἄλλα.

1 *Clemens FHG 4.464*, cf. *RE 4 (1901) 11 no. 8*

POETICA

40 *Plutarchus, Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* 13 1096A–C (BT t. 6.2 p. 146.10–147.10 Pohlenz)

- 1096 οὐκ ἦν δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἡδέως ζῆν ἐπιεικέστερον μύρα καὶ
θυμιάματα δυσχεραίνειν ὥς κάνθαροι καὶ γῦπες ἢ κριτι-
κῶν καὶ μουσικῶν λαλιὰν βδελύττεσθαι καὶ φεύγειν;
26 W ποῖος γὰρ ἂν αὐλὸς ἢ κιθάρα διηρμοσμένη πρὸς ψῆδην ἢ
τίς χορός
εὐρύοπα κέλαδον ἀκροσόφων

to make their style florid, but rather his excessive use of them.

From the second in a series of essays on the early Attic orators. Dionysius, after praising Isocrates for his lofty political aims (*Isocr.* 4–10), criticizes his polished style as unworthy of his themes (11–14, cf. 2–3), then quotes illustrative excerpts from two of his works (15–20). See D. Mirhady in this volume.

¹ Philonicus is otherwise unknown; perhaps a mistake for Isocrates' student, Philiscus of Miletus.

² The workind of this sentence differs slightly from its parallel in **38A**, and editors emend to make the parallel closer. But the differences may originate with Dionysius (rather than scribes), and his paraphrase may be more faithful to Hieronmus than Philodemus is.

³ Isocrates was notorious for his heavy use of these “Gorgianic figures,” and Dionysius objects to this repeatedly (*Isoc.* 2–3, 12, *Demosth.* 4.4, 18.7–8, etc.); for a similar complaint about Plato, see *Demosth.* 5.6 (Demetr. Phal. F 133 SOD; cf. Demetr. *Eloc.* 247). The “example,” which he critically dissects in *Isocr.* 14, is *Panegyricus* 75–80.

39 *Suda*, under “Clement” (K 1778)

Clement: historian, wrote *Kings and Emperors of the Romans* and *Against Hieronymus On the Isocratean Figures*, and other works.

An entry in a 10th-century Byzantine compendium; the entry may conflate two distinct authors; see *RE* 4 (1901) 11 no. 8, *FHG* 4.364–5. This Clement is otherwise unknown but may be the scholar cited three times elsewhere in the *Suda* for glosses (ζ 13, η 481, π 89); see A. Dyck, *HSCP* 89 (1985) 84–6. The second title here refers to the rhetorical figures favored by Isocrates, mainly antithesis, parallelism, and assonance; cf. **38B** n. 3.

LITERATURE

40 Plutarch, *That Epicurus Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible* 13 1096A–C

1096 “Was it not more befitting a pleasant life to dislike perfume and incense, as beetles and vultures do, than to deride and shun learned discussions of poetry and music? What kind of pipe or lyre tuned for song, what chorus voicing the “far-sounding cry bursting from

ἀγνόμενον διὰ στομάτων
 φθεγγόμενος οὕτως εὐφρανεν Ἐπίκουρον καὶ Μητρόδω-
 ρον, ὥς Ἀριστοτέλη καὶ Θεόφραστον καὶ Δικαίαρχον
 καὶ Ἱερώνυμον οἱ περὶ χορῶν λόγοι καὶ διδασκαλιῶν 10
 καὶ τὰ διαυλίων προβλήματα καὶ ῥυθμῶν καὶ ἀρμονιῶν;
 οἶον διὰ τί τῶν ἴσων αὐλῶν ὁ στενότερος (ὀξύτερον, ὁ δ'
 B εὐρύτερος) βαρύτερον φθέγγεται; καὶ διὰ τί τῆς σύριγ-
 γος ἀνασπωμένης πᾶσιν ὀξύνεται τοῖς φθόγγοις, κλινο-
 μένης δὲ πάλιν βαρύνεται; καὶ συναχθεὶς πρὸς τὸν 15
 ἕτερον (βαρύτερον), διαχθεὶς δ' ὀξύτερον ἤχει; καὶ τί
 δήποτε τῶν θεάτρων ἂν ἄχυρα τῆς ὀρχήστρας κατα-
 σκεδάσης, ὁ ἦχος τυφλοῦται; καὶ χαλκοῦν Ἀλέξανδρον
 ἐν Πέλλῃ βουλόμενον ποιῆσαι τὸ προσκῆνιον οὐκ εἶασεν
 ὁ τεχνίτης ὥς διαφθεροῦντα τῶν ὑποκριτῶν τὴν φωνήν; 20
 καὶ τί δήποτε τῶν γενῶν διαχεῖ τὸ χρωματικόν, ἡ δ'
 ἀρμονία συνίστησιν; ἦθη δὲ ποιητῶν καὶ πλάσματα καὶ
 C διαφοραὶ χαρακτήρων καὶ λύσεις ἀποριῶν ἐν τῷ πρέ-
 ποντι καὶ γλαφυρῷ τὸ οἰκεῖον ἅμα καὶ πιθανὸν ἔχουσαι
 τὸ τοῦ Ξενοφῶντος ἐκεῖνό μοι δοκοῦσι καὶ τὸν ἐρῶντα 25
 ποιεῖν ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι· τοσοῦτον ἡδονῇ κρατοῦσιν.

1–11 *Theophr. F 715 FHS&G, Dicaearchus F 74 Wehrli = F 96*
Mirhady, cf. Aristox. F 127 Wehrli 1–3 *cf. Theophr. CP 6.5.1* 6–
 7 *Adesp. F 90 = 1008 PMG* 8 *cf. Epicurus D.L. 10.121b = F 569*
Usener 9–11 *cf. Non posse 1095A* 13–16 *cf. Aristox. Harm. 1.21*
 16–18 *cf. [Arist.] Probl. 11.25, Plin. NH 11.270* 25–6 *Xenophon*
Cyn. 5.33

[Xcga] 7 ἀγνόμενον Xgc: ἀγνυμένων α 9 ὥς... Δικαίαρχον
 om. gd 9–10 Δικαίαρχον καὶ Ἱερώνυμον *rursus α* 10 διδασκαλι-
 ῶν Xgc: διδασκαλίας α 11 διαυλίων *Apelt: δι' αὐλῶν codd.:*
διαυλιῶν Reiske: αὐλῶν Pohlenz: διαύλων Edelstein-de Lacey: περὶ
αὐλῶν Wytttenbach 12–13 ὀξύτερον, ὁ δ' εὐρύτερος *add. Rasmus*
 14–15 κλινομένης *agc: κλινομένοις X* 15 βαρύνεται *Rasmus:*
βαρύνει codd. τὸν om. g 16 βαρύτερον *add. Xylander* 18 ὁ
 ἦχος *Pohlenz: ἡοχᾶος X: κοχᾶος gc: ἡ χοῦν, ὁ λαὸς α: ἡ χοῦν, ὁ*
ἦχος Reiske 20 τῶν α: *lac. 3 litt. X, 5–6 litt. gc* 22 συνίστησιν
 Xag: συνίσταται c πλάσματα καὶ Xac: πλασμάτων g 25
 ἐρῶντα *Reiske: ἔρωτα codd.* 26 ποιεῖν *ag: πιεῖν Xc* ἡδονῇ Xg:
 ἡδονῆς αc κρατοῦσιν Xgc: κρατούσης α

masterful mouths” ever gave Epicurus and Metrodorus the enjoyment that Aristotle, Theophrastus, Dicaearchus, and Hieronymus found in discussions of choruses and performance records, or problems about pipe-tunes, rhythms, and scales?¹ For example, why does the narrower of two pipes of equal length produce <higher B tones, and the wider one> lower tones? And why are all the tones higher when the syrinx-stop is pulled back, but lower again when it is released?² Or <lower> when the two pipes are held close together but higher when held apart? And why is the sound in a theater muffled if you blanket the dance-floor with chaff? Or why, when Alexander wanted to have a stage in Pella made of bronze, did the builder refuse for fear it would ruin the voices of the actors? And why is the chromatic scale relaxing but the harmonic rousing?³ The characters and fabrications of poets, distinctions in C styles, and solutions to puzzles, which in their polish and decorum are both apt and convincing, have the effect, as Xenophon says, of making even a lover forget his love; so much superior is the pleasure they afford.”

From a discussion of intellectual pleasures (ch. 9–14) in a polemical dialogue against Epicurean hedonism; the speaker is Plutarch’s friend Theon of Phocis. After attacking the Epicureans for focusing on pleasures of the senses, he belittles them for neglecting the pleasures of literature and history (9–10, 12), mathematics and astronomy (11), and musicology (13). Hieronymus’ work on poets is well attested (41–6, 50–2, cf. 28, 33–4); whether he also addressed musical history or theory, in either the same (see 41 n.) or another context, is unclear.

¹ Questions about “songs and performance records” highlight poetry; “pipe-tunes [or “pipe duets” or “pipes”: the text is uncertain], rhythms, and scales” concern music.

² The “syrinx-stop” was a device for raising pitch; see West (1992) 86, 102; on *auloi* or pipes, 81–107.

³ The traditional “harmonic” scale was widely considered manly and dignified, the chromatic (associated with the “new music” of the late-fifth and fourth centuries) slack and unmanly; see West (1992) 160–6.

De poetis [Περὶ ποιητῶν]

Libri Hieronymi De poetis quinque aut plures de generibus singillatim (cf. 41–2) tractasse videntur non modo de vita disserentes (41, cf. 43, 28, 33–4) sed etiam de poematis (42A, cf. 44–6, 50–2, 61), ut ante Aristoteles (F 70–7 Rose), Aristo-xenus (F 113–16 Wehrli), Phaenias (F 32–3 Wehrli), Praxiphanes Rhodius (F 11–17 Wehrli), inter alios.

Terpander

- 41 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 14.37 635E–F (BT t. 3 p. 403.1–16 Kaibel)

πηκτὶς δὲ καὶ μάγαδις ταῦτόν, καθά φησιν ὁ Ἀριστό-
 ξενος καὶ Μέναιχμος ὁ Σικυώνιος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τεχνιτῶν.
 καὶ τὴν Σαπφὴν δὲ φησιν οὗτος, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἀνακρέοντος
 πρεσβυτέρα, πρώτην χρῆσασθαι τῇ πηκτίδι. ὅτι δὲ καὶ 5
 Τέρπανδρος ἀρχαιότερος Ἀνακρέοντος δῆλον ἐκ τού-
 των· τὰ Κάρνεια πρῶτος πάντων Τέρπανδρος νικᾷ, ὡς
 Ἑλλάνικος ἱστορεῖ ἐν τε τοῖς ἐμμέτροις Καρνεονίκαις
 καὶ τοῖς καταλογάδην. ἐγένετο δὲ ἡ θέσις τῶν Καρνείων
 F κατὰ τὴν ἔκτην καὶ εἰκοστὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα, ὡς Σωσίβιός
 33 W φησιν ἐν τῷ Περὶ χρόνων. Ἱερώνυμος δ' ἐν τῷ Περὶ 10
 κιθαρωδῶν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ πέμπτον Περὶ ποιητῶν, κατὰ Λυκ-
 οῦργον τὸν νομοθέτην τὸν Τέρπανδρόν φησι γενέσθαι, ὃς
 ὑπὸ πάντων συμφώνως ἱστορεῖται μετὰ Ἰφίτου τοῦ
 Ἥλείου τὴν πρώτην ἀριθμηθεῖσαν τῶν Ὀλυμπίων θέσιν
 διαθεῖναι. 15

1–2 Aristox. F 98 Wehrli, cf. F 97, 99–101 1–4 Menaechmus 131 F
 4b FGrH, cf. 635B = F 4a 4–15 Terpander T 2 Campbell 4–10
 Hellanicus 4 F 85a FGrH, cf. Clem. Strom. 1.21.131.6 = Hellanicus F
 85b = Phaenias F 33 Wehrli 6–15 Sosibius 595 F 3 FGrH 11–12
 κατὰ Λυκοῦργον : cf. Arist. F 533 Rose

[A] 11 ante Περὶ add. τῶν Kaibel 14 Ὀλυμπίων θέσιν :
 Ὀλυμπιάδων conl. Kaibel

On poets [*On Poets*]

Hieronymus' work *On Poets*, in five or more books, was organized by genre (41–2) and discussed both their lives (41, cf. 43, 28, 33–4) and their works (42A, cf. 44–6, 50–2, 61), as had Aristotle (F 70–7 Rose), Aristoxenus (F 113–16 Wehrli), Phainias (F 32–3 Wehrli), Praxiphanes of Rhodes (F 11–17 Wehrli), and others.

Terpander

41 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 14.37 635E–F

The *pektis* and the *magadis* are the same,¹ according to Aristoxenus and Menaechmus of Sicyon in his work *On Musicians*; and the latter says that Sappho, who is older than Anacreon, was the first to use the *pektis*.² Terpander as well is older than Anacreon, as the following makes clear. Terpander was the first ever to win at the Carneia, as Hellanicus reports both in his versified *Carneian Victors* and in his catalogues; and the Carneia was established in the F 26th Olympiad [676–2 BCE], as Sosibius says in *On Dates*.³ But Hieronymus in *On Citharodes*, which is the fifth book *On Poets*, says Terpander lived in the time of Lycurgus the lawgiver, who (all reports agree) together with Iphitus of Elis organized what is counted as the first Olympics [776 BCE].

From a discussion of the names and origins of early instruments in a discourse on music (623E–639A). Terpander of Lesbos, active in Sparta in the early to mid-seventh century, was a pioneering composer and performer of songs to the kithara; for testimonia, see D. Campbell, *Greek Lyric* v. 2 (1988) 294–319. The implication here that Hieronymus dated Terpander a century too early (as Hellanicus had: 4 F 85b *FGrH* = T 5 Campbell; cf. 61A n. 7) may stem from confusion over his alleged renditions of the “laws” (*nomoi*) of Lycurgus (T 8 Campbell, *Plut. Agis* 10.3), and his role in setting “norms” (*nomoi*) for citharodic performance (T1, 18–20); see A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings* v. 1 (1984) 249–55.

¹ Early forms of harp; see West (1992) 70–5.

² Menaechmus, active in the late fourth century, also wrote a chronicle of Pythian contests based on Aristotle's list of Delphic victors (F 615–17).

³ The Carneia was a Dorian festival honoring Apollo Karneios held in the summer month of Karneios (“of the ram”); at Sparta, it included musical and athletic contests. Hellanicus of Lesbos, a fifth-century historian and mythographer, also compiled chronological data; cf. 61A n. 7. Sosibius, a scholar active in Alexandria under the first Ptolemies, was an authority on his native Sparta.

Euripides

42A *Suda* α 1842 s.v. Ἀναγυράσιος (t. 1 p. 165.17–27 Adler)

32W Ἀναγυράσιος—δημός ἐστιν Ἀναγυροῦς τῆς Ἐρεχθιδος φυλῆς, ἥς ὁ δημότης Ἀναγυράσιος. καὶ Ἀναγυράσιος δαίμων. καὶ τέμενος Ἀναγύρου ἐν τῷ δήμῳ τῶν Ἀναγυρασίων. Ἀναγυράσιος δαίμων, ἐπεὶ τὸν παροικοῦντα πρεσβύτην καὶ ἐκτέμονοντα τὸ ἄλσος ἐτιμωρή- 5
σατο Ἀνάγυρος ἥρως. Ἀναγυράσιοι δὲ δῆμος τῆς Ἀττικῆς. τούτου δὲ τις ἐξέκοψε τὸ ἄλσος. ὁ δὲ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπέμνην τὴν παλλακὴν, ἥτις μὴ δυναμένη συμπεῖσαι τὸν παῖδα διέβαλεν ὡς ἀσελγῇ τῷ πατρί. ὁ δὲ ἐπῆρωσεν αὐ- 10
τὸν καὶ ἐγκατωκοδόμησεν. ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἑαυ-
τὸν ἀνήρτησεν, ἥ δὲ παλλακὴ εἰς φρέαρ ἑαυτὴν ἔρριπεν.
ἱστορεῖ δὲ Ἱερώνυμος ἐν τῷ Περὶ τραγωδοποιῶν ἀπει-
κάζων τούτοις τὸν Εὐριπίδου Φοῖνικα.

1–2 *Harpocr.* α 109, *Phot. Lex.* α 1431 (s.v. Ἀναγυροῦς) 1
Ἐρεχθίδος: *Harpocr.* α 109, *Steph. Byz.* 91.13, recte (cf. *IG* ³ 515);
Αἰαντίδος *Phot. Lex.* α 1431 2–4 = *Phot. Lex.* α 1433 (s.v.
ἀνάγυρον κινεῖν) 4–13 = *Phot. Lex.* α 1432 (s.v. Ἀναγυράσιος
δαίμων), paene eadem *Apost.* 9.79 (*CPG* 2.479) *Hieronimo nominato*
4 cf. *Diogen. vulg.* 3.31 (*CPG* 1.219) = *Coisl.* 30 Gaisford = *Apost.* 2.96
(*CPG* 2.286) 7–12 *Suda* ε 78 (s.v. ἐγκατωκοδόμησεν) *Hieronimo*
nominato 13 *Eur. F* 801–15 TGF, cf. *Aristoph.* Ἀνάγυρος *F* 41–66
KA, *Diphilus* Ἀνάγυρος *F* 11 KA

[A, *GITFSM*] 4 Ἀναγυράσιος hinc novum glossema *GITF* 9
διέβαλεν A, *Phot.*: διέβαλλεν cett. 12 τραγωδοποιῶν: τραγω-
διοποιῶν *Apost.*

42B *Suda* ε 1137 s.v. ἐναύειν (t. 2 p. 270.15–17 Adler)

* ἐναύειν—τὸ ἱκετεύειν πρὸς τοῖς ναοῖς. “εἰ δὲ ἐντεῦθεν
Εὐριπίδης ἐναυσάμενος τὸν λόγον ἅπαντα, εἴτα μέντοι
Φοῖνικι περιτίθησιν.”

1–3 *Aelianus F* 246 *Hercher*

[A, *GMV*] 1 εἰ δὲ *AGM*: εἰσὶ δὲ *V*: ἔτι δὲ *Toup*: εἶγε *Bernhardy* 3
Φοῖνικι *AGM*: Φοῖνικοι *V* περιτίθησιν *AG*: παρατίθησιν *M*

Euripides

42A *Suda*, under “Anagyrasian” (A 1842)

Anagyrasian: there is a township Anagyrous in the tribe Erechtheis, and its townsmen are called Anagyrasians. Also Anagyrasian spirit [*daimon*]. Also a sacred precinct of Anagyrus in the township of the Anagyrasians. Anagyrasian spirit, since the old man who lived nearby and used to cut down trees in the sacred grove was punished by the hero Anagyrus. Anagyrasians are a township in Attica. Someone there cut down some trees in the sacred grove. He then got enraged at his son over his mistress:¹ when she was unable to seduce him, she told his father he had tried to rape her, and the father had him castrated and locked away. The father hung himself over this and the mistress threw herself into a well. Hieronymus reports this in *On Tragedians* and points out the parallel with Euripides’ *Phoenix*.²

An entry in a 10th-century Byzantine compendium. Anagyrous (modern Vari) was a township or “deme” near the coast SE of Athens, probably named after a local hero Anagyrus, and infested with a noxious weed (cf. 42C), which apparently bore the same name. The legend of the hero’s vengeance evidently became proverbial. Hieronymus’ interest in tragic plots may have extended to other literary genres; see A. Martano in this volume.

¹ Archaic custom condoned cohabiting with both a wife and a “mistress” or “concubine” (παλλακή); since sons of either could be legitimate heirs, tension with the wife’s children was always a risk. The custom also survived in classical Athenian law; see Lysias 1.31, Dem. 23.53, C. Carey, *Lysias: Selected Speeches* (1989) 78–9. Cf. 53A–C.

² This lost play by Euripides (F 801–15) dramatized events recounted by Phoenix in *Iliad* 9.447–77. His lost *Stheneboea* (following *Iliad* 6.155–70; cf. *Bellerophon*, also lost) had a similar plot, as does his *Hippolytus*.

42B *Suda*, under “kindle” (E 1137)

“Kindle”: to supplicate at shrines. “If Euripides, after kindling the whole story from here, then applies it to Phoenix.”

Another entry in the same work. The incomplete sentence, quoted to illustrate a metaphorical usage (the preceding entry, E 1136, illustrates the literal sense of the verb), refers to the parallel noted by Hieronymus in 42A; this excerpt very likely comes from either his *On Tragedians* or a later work (by the sophist Aelian?) derived from it.

42C Zenobius vulgatus, *Proverbia* 2.55 (CPG t. 1 p. 46.8–15)

* ἀνάγυρον κινεῖν — ἔστιν ὁ Ἀναγυροῦς δῆμος Ἀττικὸς ἔνθα δυσῶδες φυτὸν φύεται, οὕτω καλούμενον ἀνάγυρος. εἴρηται οὖν ἡ παροιμία ἐντεῦθεν ἐπὶ τῶν κινούντων τινὰ ἐπὶ κακῷ ἑαυτῶν. τινὲς δὲ λέγουσιν ὅτι Ἀνάγυρος ἥρως γέγονεν, ὅστις τοὺς οἴκους τῶν γειτονούντων αὐτῷ ἐκ βάρων ἀνέστρεψεν, ἐπειδὴ τὸ ἥρῳ ἀντοῦ ὑβρίσαι ἐπεχείρησαν. μέμνηται ταύτης Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Λυσιστράτῃ. 5

1–4 *plenius Suda* α 1843, *Coisl.* 31 Gaisford 1 *Libanius Ep.* 80.6, *Declam.* 26.21, *Diogen. vulg.* 1.52 (CPG 1.189), *Apost.* 9.99 (CPG 2.483) 1–2 *Hesych.* α 4247, *Phot. Lex.* α 1433; cf. *Hesych.* ο 904 2–3 cf. *Gal. Simpl. medic.* 16 (11.829 K) 2–4 *Suda* κ 1638, *Suda* ο 36 (s.v. ὀνόγυρος) 3–4 *Hesych.* α 4248 3–7 *Diogen. vulg.* 1.25 (CPG 1.184), *Bodl.* 56 Gaisford, *Greg. Cyp.* 1.22 (CPG 1.351), *Greg. Cyp. Mosq.* 1.22 (CPG 2.95); *aliter Coisl.* 31 Gaisford 4 κακῷ ἑαυτῶν: τῷ ἑαυτῶν κακῷ *Diogen. vulg.* 1.25, ἑαυτοῖς τὰ κακά *Suda* α 1843, οἰκείους κακοῖς *Phot. Lex.* α 1432 5 ἥρως ἐπιχώριος *Diogen. vulg.* 1.25, *Bodl.* 56 Gaisford 7–8 *Aristoph. Lys.* 67–8, *Sch. Lys.* 67–8

[P = *Parisinus* 3070, s. xii] 1 Ἀναγυροῦς: Ἀνάγυρος *Schneidewin*

Sophocles

43A Anonymous, *Vita Sophoclis* 12 (TGrF t. 3 p. 34.41–6 Radt)

31W 12 γέγονε δὲ καὶ θεοφιλὴς ὁ Σοφοκλῆς ὡς οὐκ ἄλλος, καθά φησιν Ἱερώνυμος περὶ τῆς χρυσῆς στεφάνης. ταύτης γὰρ ἐξ ἀκροπόλεως κλαπείσης, κατ' ὄναρ Ἡρακλῆς ἐδήλωσε Σοφοκλεῖ λέγων τὴν †μὴ οἰκοῦσαν† οἰκίαν ἐν δεξιᾷ εἰσιόντι ἐρευνῆσαι ἔνθα ἐκέκρυπτο. ἐμήνυσε δὲ αὐτὴν τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τάλαντον ἐδέξατο· τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν προκηρυχθέν. λαβὼν οὖν τὸ τάλαντον ἱερὸν ἰδρύσατο 5

42C Zenobius, *Proverbs* 2.55

“Stir up anagyrus”: Anagyrus is an Attic township where there grows a bad-smelling plant, also called anagyrus. So from this comes the proverb applied to people who stir up things [or someone] to bad effect on themselves. But some say there was a hero Anagyrus, who utterly obliterated the neighboring households after they tried to profane his hero-shrine. Aristophanes recalls this proverb in *Lysistrata*.¹

Zenobius, a Greek sophist active in Rome under Hadrian, produced an epitome of earlier collections of proverbs, which were later arranged alphabetically. “Some say”: including Hieronymus.

¹ *Lys.* 67–8; Aristophanes also produced a comedy entitled *Anagyrus*, probably satirizing the story. Cf. Hiller 93–5.

Sophocles

43A Anonymous, *Life of Sophocles* 12

- 12 Sophocles was also more beloved by the gods than anyone else, according to what Hieronymus says about the gold crown. When this was stolen from the acropolis, Heracles appeared to him in a dream saying that he should enter the <...> house and search on the right where it was hidden. He informed the Assembly and received a talent, as had been announced. So he took the talent and estab-

Μηνυτοῦ Ἡρακλεοῦς.

= *Soph. T* 1.12 *Radt* 6 *Hesych.* μ 1235 (s.v. Μηνυτής)

[AFGJRTV, P = *Parisinus* 2794, W = *Vindobonensis* 281] 1
θεοφιλῆς AFGRTVW (cf. *Libanius Ep.* 390.9): θεοσεβῆς JP οὐκ
AFGJPTVW: οὔτις R 2 ante περὶ lac. indic. Jahn: ἐν τῷ add. T:
ἱστορῶν add. Hiller τῆς om. W 4 λέγων om. F μὴ οἰκοῦσαν
crucibus indic. Radt: μοι οἰκοῦσαν W: μὴ J: del. Ritter: μὴ οἰκητὴν
οὔσαν Bothe: ὁμοροῦσαν Westermann: Μικοῦς vel Μητίχου Bergk:
Μίκωνος Dindorf: Μ(ε)νοικ(έως τινὸς τυχ)οῦσαν Marcovich ἐν
om. GR 5 post ἔνθα add. καὶ Michaelis ἐκέκρυπτο AFGPR:
ἐκρύπτετο TVW: κέκρυπται J 6 αὐτὴν AFGJRTVW: αὐτὸν P

43B Cicero, *De divinatione* 1.54 (BT t. 46 p. 34.7–16 Giomini)

- * 54 adiungamus philosophis doctissimum hominem, poetam
quidem divinum, Sophoclem, qui cum ex aede Herculis
patera aurea gravis subrepta esset, in somnis vidit ipsum
deum dicentem qui id fecisset. quod semel ille iterumque
neglexit. ubi idem saepius, ascendit in Arium pagum, 5
detulit rem; Areopagitae comprehendere iubent eum qui a
Sophocle erat nominatus; is quaestione adhibita confessus
est pateramque rettulit. quo facto fanum illud Indicis
Herculis nominatum est.

= *Soph. T* 167b *Radt*

[AVH, BFM] 4 dicentem codd.: indicantem Jahn qui id ABFM²:
quid VHM: quis Marsus 5 post saepius add. admonet ed. Romana
(1471) ascendit ABFMV²: scendit HV

43C Tertullian, *De anima* 46.9 (p. 64.7–15 Waszink)

- * 9 revelantur et honores et ingenia per quietem, praestan-
tur et medellae, produntur et furta, conferuntur et thesauri.
Ciceronis denique dignitatem parvuli etiamnunc gerula iam
sua inspexerat. Cynus de sinu Socratis demulcens hom-

lished a shrine for Heracles the Informer.

From a brief “Life” found in some manuscripts of Sophocles. This anecdote most likely appeared in *On Tragedians* or (and?) *Historical Notes* (cf. 33–4); and with its multiple links to civic institutions, it looks like an authentic Attic legend. But it implies nothing about Hieronymus’ attitude toward prophetic dreams; cf. 43B n.

43B Cicero, *On Divination* 1.54

- 54 “To the philosophers¹ let’s add a very learned man, in fact a divine poet, Sophocles. When a heavy gold dish was stolen from a shrine of Heracles, the god himself appeared to him in a dream and told him who had done it. He ignored this the first time and then again, but when the dream kept appearing, he went up to the Areopagus and reported the crime. The judges ordered the arrest of the man Sophocles named, who under questioning confessed and returned the dish. After this the shrine was named Hercules the Informer.”

From the defense of divination delivered by Cicero’s brother Quintus in Book 1, in a long discussion of dreams (39–71); dreams were classified with oracles and other kinds of inspiration as a “natural” form of divination, in contrast to “technical” forms like omens (72–108), which required interpretation by experts. Cicero cites many sources, most notably Chrysippus (1.6, 39), Posidonius (1.6, 64), and the contemporary Peripatetic Cratippus (1.5, 70–1), who followed Dicaearchus in accepting prophetic dreams (F 30–1 Mirhady).

¹ The preceding examples (1.52–3) are from Plato (*Crito* 44A–B), Xenophon (*Anab.* 32.1.11–13), and Aristotle (*Eudemus* F 37 Rose). Previous examples come from Greek and Roman history and legend (1.39–51); further examples are (with two exceptions) from Roman history (1.55–9).

43C Tertullian, *On the soul* 46.9

- 9 Also honors and talents are revealed in sleep, cures are provided, thefts uncovered, and treasures conferred. Thus, when Cicero was still a boy, a nursemaid foresaw his future eminence. A swan on the lap of Socrates soothing people is his student Plato.

ines discipulus Plato est. Leonymus pyctes ab Achille 5
 curatur in somniis. coronam auream cum ex arce Athenae
 perdidissent, Sophocles tragicus somniando redinvenit.
 Neoptolemus tragoedus apud Rhoeteum Troiae sepulcrum
 Aiakis monitus in somnis ab ipso ruina liberat, et cum
 lapidum senia deponit, dives inde auro redit. 10

3 *Plut. Cicero* 2 4-5 *Apul. De Plat.* 1.1, *Orig. C. Celsum* 6.8, *Pausanias*
 1.30.3, *D.L.* 3.7, *Olymp. Vita Plat.* 4, *Suda* π 1707 5-6 cf. *Pausanias*
 3.19.11-13, *Hermias In Phaedr.* 243A (75.10-26 *Couvreur*), *Phot. Bibl.*
Cod. 186 133b11-25 = *Conon* 26 F 1.18 *FGrH* (de *Autoleone*) 6-
 8 *Soph. T* 167c *Radt*

[AB] 5 Leonymus AB: Cleonymus *Gelenius* 7 perdidissent A:
 prodidissent B 8 Rhoeteum *Junius*: ritreum A: Erithreum B,
Gelenius: Roeteum *Reifferscheid*

De fabulis

44A Clemens Alexandrinus, *Protrepticus* 2.30.3-7 (GCS t. 12 p.
 22.14-23.7 Stählin)

3 οὗτος μὲν οὖν κεῖται κεραυνωθεὶς ἐν τοῖς Κυνοσουρί-
 dos ὀρίοις. Φιλόχορος δὲ ἐν Τήνῳ Ποσειδῶνά φησι τιμᾶ-
 σθαι ἰατρόν, Κρόνῳ δὲ ἐπικεῖσθαι Σικελίαν καὶ ἐνταῦθα
 4 αὐτὸν τεθάφθαι. Πατροκλῆς τε ὁ Θούριος καὶ Σοφοκλῆς
 ὁ νεώτερος ἔν τισι τραγῳδίαις ἱστορεῖτον τοῖν Διοσκού- 5
 ροιν πέρι· ἀνθρώπῳ τινὲ τούτῳ τῷ Διοσκούρῳ ἐπικήρῳ
 ἐγενέσθην, εἴ τῳ ἱκανὸς πιστώσασθαι Ὅμηρος τὸ λελεγ-
 μένον,
 τοὺς δ' ἤδη κάτεχεν φυσίζοος αἶα
 ἐν Λακεδαίμονι αὖθι, φίλῃ ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ. 10
 5 προσίτω δὲ καὶ ὁ τὰ Κυπριακὰ ποιήματα γράψας,
 Κάστωρ μὲν θνητός, θανάτου δέ οἱ αἶσα πέπρωται·
 αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' ἀθάνατος Πολυδεύκης, ὅζος Ἄρης.
 6 τοῦτο μὲν ποιητικῶς ἐψεύσατο· Ὅμηρος δὲ ἀξιοπιστό-
 τερος αὐτοῦ εἰπὼν περὶ ἀμφοῖν τοῖν Διοσκούροιν, πρὸς 15
 δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα εἰδῶλον ἐλέγξας· “φῶτα” γὰρ
 Ἡρακλῆα, μεγάλων ἐπίστορα ἔργων.
 16W 7 Ἡρακλέα οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς Ὅμηρος θνητὸν οἶδεν ἀνθρω-

The boxer Leonymus is cured by Achilles in his dreams. When a gold crown was taken from the Athenian acropolis, Sophocles the tragedian recovered it by dreaming. Neoptolemus the tragic actor, warned by Ajax in a dream at his tomb at Rhoetus near Troy, rescues it from destruction, and when he removes the decayed stones, he comes away rich in gold.¹

In an extended discussion of dreams (45–9), Tertullian recounts a series of cases to show that prophetic dreams occur (46.4–9). He cites as his primary source Hermippus of Berytus (46.11), a Hadrianic scholar whose five books on interpreting dreams compiled material from many sources, including (see 46.10) Strato (cf. F 128–31 Wehrli), Cratippus (cf. **43B** n.), and Philochorus (cf. **44A**).

¹ The dreams about Plato and Cicero are widely reported, Leonymus' of Croton rather less (see Burkert 152–3 for Pythagorean connections), and Neoptolemus' only here.

On myths

44A Clement of Alexandria, *Exhortation* 2.30.3–7

3 So this one [Asclepius] lies struck by a thunderbolt in the hills
of Cynosouris.¹ Philochorus says that Poseidon is honored as a
healer on Tenos, and that Sicily covers Kronos and he is buried
4 in a tomb there.² Let Patroclus of Thurii and Sophocles the younger
in their tragedies tell about the Dioscuri; these two Dioscuri were
mortal humans, if Homer is enough to corroborate the legend:
“them the life-giving earth already held in Lacedaemon again, their
5 own native land.”³ Bring forth also the author of the *Cypria*:
“Castor is mortal and death his destined fate; but immortal is
6 Polydeuces, scion of Ares.” That is a poet's fiction, and Homer is
more credible in what he says about both of the Dioscuri, and also
when he proves Heracles is a “phantom”: “Heracles the man, adept
7 in great deeds.” So even Homer himself knows Heracles is a mortal

πον. Ἰερώνυμος δὲ ὁ φιλόσοφος καὶ τὴν σχέσιν αὐτοῦ
 ὑφηγεῖται τοῦ σώματος, μικρόν, φριξότριχα, ῥωστικόν· 20
 Δικαίαρχος δὲ σχιζίαν, νευρώδη, μέλανα, γρυπόν, ὑπο-
 χαροπόν, τετανότριχα. οὗτος οὖν ὁ Ἡρακλῆς δύο πρὸς
 τοῖς πενήκοντα ἔτη βεβιωκὼς κατέστρεψε τὸν βίον διὰ
 τῆς ἐν Οἴτῃ πυρᾶς κεκηδευμένος.

1–2 cf. Cic. ND 3.57, Philod. Piet. (PHerc 247) col. 4b.5–21, Athenag.
 Leg. 29.1 (cum Hes. F 51 MW), Arnob. 4.24, Asclep. T 105–20 Edelstein
 2–4 Philochorus 328 F 175 FGrH 3–4 cf. Diod. Sic. 3.61 = Dionys.
 Scyt. 32 F 7 FGrH 4–6 Patrocles 57–8 F 2 TGrF, Soph. iun. 62 F
 1 TGrF, cf. Philod. Piet. (PHerc 247) col. 5a.23–b.3 9–10 Il. 3.243–
 4 (Od. 11.298–304 aliter, cf. Pind. Nem. 10.55–90, Apollod. 3.11.2), cf.
 Cic. ND 3.11 12–13 Cypria F 6 Davies, cf. Pherecydes F 29 FGH
 1.78 (om. 3 F 9 FGrH), Apollod. 3.10.7 16 εἰδωλον: Od. 11.602
 16–17 Od. 21.26 20 μικρόν: cf. Pind. Isth. 3.71 = 4.53 21–2
 Dicaearchus F 54 Wehrli = F 67 Mirhady 21 σχιζίαν: λεπτὸς παρὰ
 Ἀττικοῖς, ὡς Διογενιανός φησι, Sch. ad loc. 23–4 cf. Soph. Trach.
 1191–1202, Cic. ND 3.41, Arnob. 1.36, 41

[P: Parisinus 451, a. 913/4] 5 ἔν τισι Welcker: ἐν τρισὶ P
 ἱστορεῖτων: ἱστορεῖτον Sylburg τοῖν Διοσκούροιιν Sylburg: τῶ
 Διοσκούρῳ P: τῶν Διοσκούρων Arcerius 7 ἐγενέσθην Dindorf:
 γενέσθην P 20 μικρόν: μακρόν Höschel (cf. Gell. NA 1.1)

44B Arnobius, *Adversus nationes* 4.25 (p. 231.20–231.3 Marchesi)

in Spartanis et Lacedaemoniis finibus nos dicimus con-
 ditos in cunis coalitos fratres? noster ille est auctor, qui
 Patrocles Thurius scriptorum in titulis indicantur, qui
 tumulos memorat reliquiasque Saturnias tellure in Sicula
 17W contineri? Hieronymus † Plutarchus nostrarum esse par-
 tium comprobatur, qui in Oetaeis verticibus Herculem post 5

human.⁴ Hieronymus the philosopher even describes his bodily figure: short, curly-haired, and strong; and Dicaearchus says he was lean and muscular with dark skin, a hooked nose, light blue eyes, and long hair. This Heracles, then, lived 52 years and was buried after ending his life in the funeral pyre on Mt. Oeta.⁵

From a litany of examples of mortal defects in gods (2.26–40) in a polemic against pagan (mainly Greek) religion c. 190 CE; Clement here cites some gods and deified heroes who “died.” Parallels with other extant works (esp. Philodemus *On Piety*, Cicero *On the Nature of the Gods*, Arnobius) show that he draws heavily on Hellenistic critiques of Greek religion. Heracles, with Asclepius and the Dioscuri (literally “boys of Zeus”) is a standard example of apotheosis (cf. Cic. *ND* 2.62, 3.39, 45). Here the physical descriptions by Hieronymus and Dicaearchus are meant to indicate his mortality; cf. **46A–B** for another case of immortality. Wehrli 32 relates **44A** and **44B** to ethical debates (cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 2.19–22): debunking a popular exemplar of Cynic and Stoic ideals.

¹ The preceding lines quote verses on the death of Asclepius from Pindar (*Pyth.* 3.55–8) and Euripides (*Alc.* 3–4).

² For the Sicilian Kronos (probably a syncretistic assimilation of either the Punic Baal or the Roman Saturn, or both), see Diod. Sic. 3.61, from Dionysius “Scytobrachion” of Mitylene (mid-third century BCE) in his Euhemerist account of Libyan myth F 7). For Poseidon on Tenos, see Jacoby on Philochorus F 175–6, *FGrH* 3B Suppl. 1 (1954) 547–8.

³ Clement (or his source) ignores *Odyssey* 11.298–304, which ascribes immortality to both. For the divergent literary sources, see A. Hermay, *LIMC* 3.1 (1986) 567–8.

⁴ Clement (or his source) is misleading: although the *Iliad* depicts Heracles as mortal (see esp. 18.117–19), as does the *Odyssey* in the line quoted here (21.26), the *Odyssey* (in line allegedly interpolated in the sixth century BCE; see *Sch. Od.* 11.385, 604, cf. Hes. F 25.25–33 MW) refers to his apotheosis and assigns only his “phantom” to Hades (11.602–4; cf. Hes. *Theog.* 950–5).

⁵ The tale of Heracles’ death in a pyre on Mt. Oeta was tied to his apotheosis by the mid-fifth century BCE; see P. Easterling, “The End of the *Trachiniae*,” *ICS* (1981) 56–74, cf. J. Boardman, *LIMC* 5.1 (1990) 121–32.

44B Arnobius, *Against the Gentiles* 4.25

Do we say that the twin brothers [sc. Dioscuri] are buried in mounds in the land of Sparta and Lacedaemonia?¹ Is he an authority of ours, the one identified in the title as Patrocles of Thurii, who records that the tomb and remains of Saturn reside in the land of Sicily? Is Hieronymus Plutarch approved as on our side, who has reported that Hercules after being wracked by seizures was re-

morborum comitialium ruinas dissolutum in cinerem prodidit?

1–3 cf. *Patrocles* 57–8 F 2 TGrF 3–5 cf. *Philochorus* 328 F 175 FGrH 5–8 *Plut.* F 8 Sandbach, cf. F 6–7 et *tabula Lampriae* no. 34 Ἡρακλέους βίος

[*P* = *Parisinus* 1661, s. ix] 1 et *Lacedaemoniis secl.* Zink 3 *Thurius Canter*: *hurius P* 5 *heronymus*: *Chaeroneus Sabaeus*: *lac. indic. Reifferscheid* *plutharchus*: et *Dicaearchus Nourry*: aut *Dicaearchus Zink*: *Peripateticus conieci*, cf. 2.9 7 *comitialium Sabaeus*: *comitalium P*

45 *Etymologicum Gudianum* s. v. ἀλκαία (t. 1 p. 90.14–15 + 91.17–19 De Stefani)

29W ἀλκαία — ἡ οὐρά. κυρίως ἡ τοῦ λέοντος διὰ τὸ εἰς ἀλκὴν αὐτὸν τρέπειν· ἔχει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῇ οὐρᾷ κέντρον ὕφ' οὗ παροξύνεται, κα(θῶς) Ἱερώνυμος καὶ Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἐν Ὑπομνή(ματι) Ἀσπίδος.

1–4 *Ephroditus* F 52 Luenzner 1 ἀλκαία: cf. *Callim.* F 177.23 (*de muribus in fabula de Hercule apud Molorchum*), *Ap. Rhod.* 4.1614 (*de Tritone*), *Nic. Ther.* 123 (*de Tauri stellis*) 1–3 *Sch. Hes. Scut.* 430–1, *Sch. Il.* 20.170–1, *Eustath.* *In Il.* 20.168, *Sch. Ap. Rhod.* 4.1614b–c, *Sch. Nic. Ther.* 123a, *Ael. NA* 5.39, 6.1 (*unde Ar. Byz. Epit.* 2.157), *Methodius apud Et. Gen.* 407 (*unde Et. Magn.* 66.5), *Phot. Lex.* α 977, *Lex. Bachm.* 76.19–22, *Lex. Aἰμ.* 618.24–5

[*D cum apographis COW*] 2–4 ἔχει ... Ἀσπίδος *add. D² in margine* 2 κέντρον *COW*: κέντρ[*D²* ὕφ': ἄφ' *Sturz* 3 καθὼς *Martano*: κα[*D²*: καθὼς φασὶν *O*: καθὼς φησιν *W*: καθά φησιν *C* Ἱερώνυμος: Ἡρωδιανὸς *Nauck* 4 Ὑπομνήματι *suppl. De Stefani* (cf. 177.23 s.v. ἀπότροπος οἶνος = *Ephroditus* F 51 Luenzner): ὕπομνη *D²*: ὕπομνήσει *Sturz* 4 Ἀσπίδος *suppl. Sturz*: Ἀσπίδ[*D²*: Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου *COW*

46A *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem* 11.1 (t. 3 p. 123.1–5 Erbse)

15aW Ἱερώνυμός φησι τὸν Τιθωνὸν αἰτήσασθαι ἀθανασίαν παρὰ τῆς Ἥου̃ς, οὐ μέντοι καὶ ἀγήρασίαν. ὥς δὲ πολλῶ τῷ γήρᾳ χρώμενος ἐδυσφόρει, αἰτήσασθαι θάνατον. τὴν δὲ ἀδυνατοῦσαν εἰς τέττιγα αὐτὸν μεταβαλεῖν, ὅπως

duced to ashes on Mt. Oeta?

In a protracted polemic against pagan religion c. 300 CE, Arnobius (a rhetorician from Roman Numidia) cites these “deaths” in a series of cases intended to display defects in Greek and Roman divinities (4.21-8). Numerous parallels with Clement in much of this work may reflect direct borrowing; see E. Rapisarda, *Clemente fonte di Arnobio* (1939). But substantial differences suggest that both (also?) drew on a common source or sources. In any case, Arnobius repeatedly distorts what he found; here he first mistakes the attribution to Patrocles, then (unless the text is corrupt) turns “Dicaearchus” into “Plutarch” and misconstrues this as a name or epithet of Hieronymus (or vice versa).

1 “We” refers to Christians as opposed to pagans.

45 *Gudian Lexicon*, under “*alkaia*”

alkaia: the tail; strictly the lion’s, because it rouses his might [*alké*]; for he has a goad on his tail by which he is incited, according to Hieronymus and Epaphroditus in his *Commentary on the Shield*.¹

An entry in a Byzantine lexicon (named after M. Gude, a seventeenth-century German collector of manuscripts who discovered the text). Epaphroditus (c. 22–c. 96 CE), a scholar from Chaeronea who was active in Alexandria and Rome, also wrote commentaries on Homer and Callimachus; he apparently cited Hieronymus, probably to explain a phrase in a simile comparing Heracles to a lion (*Shield* 430–1, cf. *Iliad* 20.170–1). This bit of folklore about the lion’s tail is well attested in literary sources (cf. ἄλκαῖα in Callim. *Aet.* F 177.23 = *SH* 259.23 and Ap. Rhod. 4.1614, both contemporary with Hieronymus) but not in early zoological works; hence, the original context in Hieronymus was probably literary. For discussion, see A. Martano in this volume, who suggests that Hieronymus addressed the *Shield* directly; cf. R. Sharples in *Aristo of Ceos*.

¹ The *Shield*, an epyllion about Heracles’ combat with Cynus (cf. 44A–B on Heracles), circulated under Hesiod’s name but was widely recognized as spurious.

46A Scholium on Homer’s *Iliad* 11.1

Hieronymus says that Tithonus asked Dawn for immortality, but not freedom from aging as well; when he had trouble enduring very old age, he asked to die. When she was unable to do this, she turned him into a cicada so she would have the pleasure of listening to his

ἥδοιτο διηνεκῶς τῆς φωνῆς ἀκούουσα.

1–5 cf. *Hellanicus* 4 F 140 FGrH = *Sch. Il.* 3.151, *Clearchus* F 56 Wehrli (cf. F 55) = *Zenobius* 6.18 (CPG 1.166), *Sch. Aristoph. Acharn.* 688, *ps.-Plut.* 1.68 (CPG 1.332), *Suda* σ 578, *Apost.* 16.57 (CPG 2.676); cf. *Aristo Ceus* F 18 SFOD = 12 Wehrli (cf. F 16 SFOD = 33 Wehrli), *Varro* F 544–8 Astbury, *Diogen. vulg.* 8.37 (CPG 1.312), *Greg. Cyp. Leid.* 3.13 (CPG 2.87), *Macar.* 8.36 (CPG 2.219)

3–4 τὴν δὲ ἀδυνατοῦσαν ... μεταβαλεῖν **b**: ἡ δὲ ἀδυνατοῦσα ... μεταβάλλει **AT**

46B Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* 11.1 (t. 3 p. 133.20–134.4 van der Valk)

^{15b W} φασὶ δὲ Ἱερώνυμόν τινα ἱστορεῖν ὅτι Τιθωνὸς ἀδελφὸς Πριάμου ἐς βαθὺ γῆρας ἐλάσας καὶ ζῆν μηκέτι ἐθέλων ἡτήσατο παρὰ τῆς Ἥοῦς θάνατον, συνοικῶν αὐτῇ κατὰ ἔρωτα. ἡ δὲ ἀδυνατοῦσα, ἥδη γὰρ ἐνεγράφη τοῖς ἀθανάτοις ὁ Τιθωνός, εἰς τέττιγα μετέβαλεν αὐτόν, 5 ὥς ἂν ἥδοιτο τῆς αὐτοῦ φωνῆς ἐς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἀκούουσα.

De philosophis

Haec de philosophis magna parte a Diogene Laertio traduntur, qui locos duos τοῖς Σποράδην ὑπομνήμασιν adscribit (**47, 49**); nec veri dissimile est alios quoque locos (**48, 53A–C**) e fonte eadem haustos esse. Alia quae de poematis a philosophis (ut **52**) vel de philosophis (ut **51**) conscriptis apud Diogenem narrantur ex illis potius libris De poetis hausta esse licet (cf. **50, 61**). Cetera quae de Socraticis narrantur libro De retentione (sc. adsensionis) adscripta sunt vel expressis verbis (**54**), vel emendatione paene certa (**55**), vel coniectura non improbabile (**56**).

voice forever.

A note on *Iliad* 11.1–2 (= *Od.* 5.1–2): “Dawn arose from bed beside illustrious Tithonus.” The “old age of Tithonus” was proverbial; his tale is first told in the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* 218–38 (cf. Hes. *Theog.* 984–5, Mimn. F 4 West), and his transformation into a cicada is first attested for the fifth-century BCE chronicler Hellanicus (F 140; cf. **61A** n. 7). Wehrli 31 relates this to Hieronymus’ account of *eudaimonia*, which Tithonus could illustrate by way of contrast. But a literary context is at least as likely; cf. **44** for another mortal immortalized.

46B Eustathius, *Commentary on Homer’s Iliad* 11.1

They say that some Hieronymus reports that Priam’s brother Tithonus, after living to a deep old age, did not wish to live any longer and asked for death from Dawn, with whom he lived as her lover. When she was unable to do this, since Tithonus was already inscribed among the immortals, she turned him into a cicada so she would have the pleasure of listening to his voice forever.

The second of five comments on the myth of Tithonus in the massive Byzantine compilation of Eustathius (twelfth century). The preceding comment reports an allegorization of Tithonus as the sun (cf. **60A** n.), the following two trace the cicada’s chirping to Tithonus’ persistent complaints.

On philosophers

Most of the following reports about philosophers are preserved by Diogenes Laertius, who ascribes two to Hieronymus’ *Miscellaneous Notes* (**47**, **49**), and it is not unlikely that other reports (**48**, **53A–C**) derive from the same source. The other reports in Diogenes about poems by (**52**) or about (**51**) philosophers may come instead from *On Poets* (cf. **50**, **61**). The remaining reports about some Socratics are ascribed to his work *On Suspension* either explicitly (**54**), or by a virtually certain emendation (**55**), or by plausible conjecture (cf. **56** n.).

Thales

- 47** Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 1.26 (BT t. 1 p. 19.5–12 Marcovich)

καὶ λέγουσιν ὅτι τῆς μητρὸς ἀναγκαζούσης αὐτὸν γῆ-
 39W μαὶ ἔλεγεν “οὐδέπω καιρός.” εἶτα, ἐπειδὴ παρήβησεν
 ἐγκειμένης, εἰπεῖν “οὐκέτι καιρός.” φησὶ δὲ καὶ Ἱερώνυμος ὁ Ῥόδιος ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν Σποράδην ὑπομνη-
 μάτων ὅτι βουλόμενος δεῖξαι ῥᾶον εἶναι πλουτεῖν, 5
 φορᾶς ἐλαιῶν μελλούσης ἔσεσθαι προνοήσας ἐμισθώ-
 σατο τὰ ἐλαιουργεῖα καὶ ἀμπλειςτα συνεῖλε χρήματα.

1–7 *Thales* 11 A 1.26 DK 1–3 cf. *Stob.* 4 22.58 (4.520 Hense),
Gnom. Vat. 318, *Plut. QC* 3.6.3 654B–C; *similia apud Plut. Solon* 6
 81B–D, *D.L.* 6.54 = *Diog. Sinop.* 5 B 200 SSR 2 5–7 cf. *Arist. Pol.*
 1.11 1259a6–19 = 11 A 10 DK, *Cic. Div.* 1.111

[BPF, D, Φ] 3–4 καὶ Ἱερώνυμος *Cobet*: ἱερώνυμος καὶ BP:
 ἱερώνυμος F 5 ῥᾶον: ῥάδιον *Hermann* (cf. *Arist.* 1259a17) *post*
 εἶναι *add.* τοῖς σοφοῖς *Marcovich*: *post* πλουτεῖν *add.* φιλοσόφοις
Volkmann (cf. *Arist.* 1259a17) 6 ἐλαιῶν *om.* BPF 7 συνεῖλε BPF:
 συνῆξε Φ: συνέλεξε *Cobet* (cf. *Arist.* 1259a16)

- 48** Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 1.27 (BT t. 1 p. 19.13–20.4 Marcovich)

27 ἀρχὴν δὲ τῶν πάντων ὕδωρ ὑπεστήσατο, καὶ τὸν κόσ-
 μον ἔμψυχον καὶ δαιμόνων πλήρη. τὰς τε ὥρας τοῦ ἐνι-
 αὐτοῦ φασιν αὐτὸν εὐρεῖν καὶ εἰς τριακοσίας ἐξήκοντα
 πέντε ἡμέρας διελεῖν. οὐδεὶς δὲ αὐτοῦ καθηγήσατο,
 40W πλὴν ὅτι εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐλθὼν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι συνδιέτριπεν. 5
 ὁ δὲ Ἱερώνυμος καὶ ἐκμετρησαί φησιν αὐτὸν τὰς
 πυραμίδας ἐκ τῆς σκιᾶς, παρατηρήσαντα ὅτε ἡμῖν

Thales

47 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 1.26

They say that when Thales' mother was trying to compel him to marry, he would say, "The time is not yet right"; then when he had grown up and she persisted, he said, "The time is no longer right." Hieronymus of Rhodes as well says in the second book of his *Miscellaneous Notes*, that Thales wanted to show that it is easier to get rich;¹ when the olive harvest was near, he foresaw this and rented the olive presses, then collected enormous profits.

From Diogenes' "Life of Thales" (1.22–44); 48 follows immediately. The anecdote about marriage (which follows conflicting claims about Thales having children) and Hieronymus' report about the olives (recorded already in Arist. *Politics* 1.11) share the common theme of knowing the "opportune" time; but there are no grounds for ascribing the former to Hieronymus.

¹ Hieronymus says "easier" where Aristotle says "easy" (1259a17); the difference could originate with Hieronymus, D.L., or scribes (editors of D.L. emend). A comparative implies a contrast either of activities (getting rich is easier than Thales' inquiries) or of people (easier for the wise to get rich).

48 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 1.27

- 27 Water he posited as source of all things, and he held that the cosmos is animate and full of divinities. They say he discovered the seasons of the year and divided it into 365 days. He had no instructor, except that he went to Egypt and spent time with the priests.

ἰσομεγέθης ἐστί.

1–8 *Thales* 11 A 1.27 DK 1–5 cf. *Sch. Plat. Remp.* 600A = 11 A 3 DK
1 cf. *Arist. Meta.* 1.3 983b20–84a3 = 11 A 12 DK, *Simpl. In Phys.* 1.2
(CAG 9 p. 23.21–9) = 11 A 13 DK = *Theophr. F* 225 FHS&G, *Plut. De*
Isid. 34 364C = 11 A 11c DK 1–2 cf. *Arist. De an.* 1.5 411a7–8 = 11
A 22 DK, *Aët.* 4.2.1 = 11 A 22a DK 4–5 cf. *Procl. In Eucl.* 65.7–11
= 11 A 11a DK = *Eudemus F* 133 Wehrli, *Aët.* 1.3.1 = 11 A 11e DK, *Jo-*
seph. C. Ap. 1.2 = 11 A 11d DK, *Iambl. VP* 12 = 11 A 11f DK 6–8
cf. *Plin. NH* 36.82 = 11 A 21a DK, *Plut. Sept. sap. conv.* 2 147A = 11 A
21b DK

4 δὲ PF: τε BΦ 5 ὅτι FΦ: ὅτ' BP 6 ὁ ... αὐτὸν BPF: τοῦτόν φασι
καὶ Φ 7 ἰσομεγέθης ἐστί *Menagius*: ἰσομεγέθεις εἰσὶν *codd.*

Anaxagoras

- 49 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 2.13–14 (BT t. 1 p. 100.15–101.8 Marcovich)

Ἑρμιππος δ' ἐν τοῖς Βίοις φησὶν ὅτι καθεύχθη ἐν τῷ
δεσμοτηρίῳ τεθνηξόμενος. Περικλῆς δὲ παρελθὼν εἶπεν
εἴ τι ἔχουσιν ἐγκαλεῖν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὸν βίον· οὐδὲν δὲ εἰ-
πόντων, “καὶ μὴν ἐγώ,” ἔφη, “τούτου μαθητής εἰμι. μὴ
οὖν διαβολαῖς ἐπαρθέντες ἀποκτείνητε τὸν ἄνθρωπον, 5
ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ πεισθέντες ἄφετε.” καὶ ἀφείθη· οὐκ ἐνεγκὼν
41W 14 δὲ τὴν ὕβριν ἑαυτὸν ἐξήγαγεν. Ἰερώνυμος δ' ἐν τῷ δευ-
τέρῳ τῶν Σποράδην ὑπομνημάτων φησὶν ὅτι ὁ Περικλῆς
παρήγαγεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ δικαστήριον διερρηκτότα καὶ
λεπτὸν ὑπὸ νόσου, ὥστε ἐλέω μᾶλλον ἢ κρίσει ἀφεθῆ- 10
ναι. καὶ τὰ μὲν περὶ τῆς δίκης αὐτοῦ τοσαῦτα.

1–11 *Anaxag.* 59 A 1.13–14 DK 1–7 *Hermippus F* 30 Wehrli; cf.
D.L. 2.12 = *Sotion F* 3 Wehrli et *Satyrus F* 14 (FHG 3.163), *D.L.* 2.15
= *Anth. Pal.* 7.95, *Olymp. In Meteor.* 1.3 (CAG 12) 17.22–3 = 59 A 19b
DK, *Suda* α 1981 = 59 A 3 DK 1–2 cf. *Diod. Sic.* 12.39.2 = *Ephorus*
70 F 196 FGrH = 59 A 17b DK, *Plut. Per.* 32.5 = 59 A 17a DK, *Nic.*
23.4 = 59 A 18 DK, *De superst.* 169F, *De exil.* 607F = 59 A 38 DK,
Joseph. C. Ap. 2.265 = 59 A 19a DK 4 μαθητής: *Plat. Phdr.* 270A
= 59 A 15a DK, *Isocr. Antid.* 235 = 59 A 15b DK, *Plut. Per.* 4 = 59 A 15c
DK

2 εἶπεν: εἰπεῖν ἐκέλευσεν *Crönert* 3 αὐτῷ *Stephanus*: αὐτῷ *codd.*

Hieronymus says he also measured the pyramids from the shadow by observing when it is the same size as us.¹

Immediately following 47; the first three sentences are supplied only for context. The report about pyramids may derive from the historical *Research in Geometry* by Eudemus of Rhodes; cf. L. Zhmud, “Eudemus’ History of Mathematics,” in *Eudemus* (2002) 263–306.

¹ What exactly Thales did is unclear: “it” (a widely accepted emendation based on Pliny, *NH* 36.82) presumably refers to a shadow, either “ours” or a pyramid’s; alternatively, “they” (in the received text) would refer to multiple shadows, either of the several pyramids or of each and our own. See R. Goulet, “Thalès et l’ombre des pyramides,” in *ΕΠΙΕΙΚΕΙΑ: Studia Graeca in Memoriam J. L. Turo*, ed. M. Alganza Roldán et al. (2000) 199–212.

Anaxagoras

49 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 2.13–14

Hermippus says in his *Lives* that Anaxagoras was confined in the prison to be executed. Pericles came forward and asked if they had any complaint about his own life; and when they said they did not, he said, “But I myself am a student of this man. So do not be incited by slanders and put the man to death; rather be persuaded by me and release him.” And Anaxagoras was released. But he
14 could not bear the humiliation and killed himself. Hieronymus says in the second book of his *Miscellaneous Notes* that Pericles brought Anaxagoras to the court worn out and emaciated by illness, so that he was released more from pity than by decision. So much about his trial.

From Diogenes’ “Life of Anaxagoras” (2.6–15), in a series of conflicting reports about the trial, including Sotion F 3 Wehrli and Satyrus F 14 *FHG* 3 in 2.12–13; Diogenes goes on to report that Anaxagoras returned to Lampsacus before he died. See J. Mansfeld, *Mnemosyne* 33 (1980) 17–95, who dates the trial to 437/6.

Pythagoras

- 50 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 8.21 (BT t. 1 p. 585.8–14 Marcovich)

42W φησὶ δ' Ἱερώνυμος κατελθόντα αὐτὸν εἰς ἄδου τὴν
μὲν Ἡσιόδου ψυχὴν ἰδεῖν πρὸς κίονι χαλκῷ δεδεμένην
καὶ τρίζουσαν, τὴν δ' Ὀμήρου κρεμαμένην ἀπὸ δένδρου
καὶ ὄφεις περὶ αὐτὴν ἀνθ' ὧν εἶπον περὶ θεῶν,
κολαζομένους δὲ καὶ τοὺς μὴ θέλοντας συνεῖναι ταῖς 5
ἑαυτῶν γυναιξί· καὶ δὴ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τιμηθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν
ἐν Κρότωνι.

1–6 = *Suda* π 3124 (s.v. Πυθαγόρας) *Hieronymo non nominato*; cf. *D.L.*
8.41 = *Hermippus* F 20 Wehrli, *Tertull. De An.* 28.2–3, *Sch. Soph. El.*
62 = *Suda* η 88 (s.v. ἥδη), *Aen. Gaz. Theophr.* 901C 5–7 cf. *Iambl.*
VP 47–8, 50, 55, 57, *D.L.* 8.43

3 κρεμαμένην *F*: κρεμαμένην *P*: κεκραμένην *B* 4 εἶπον *BP*,
Suda: εἶπε *FD* 6 ἑαυτῶν *F*, *Suda*: αὐτῶν *BPD* καὶ² *om. F*

Heraclitus

- 51 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 9.15–16 (BT t. 1 p. 641.7–16 Marcovich)

πλεῖστοί τε εἰσιν ὅσοι ἐξήγηνται αὐτοῦ τὸ σύγγραμμα·
καὶ γὰρ Ἀντισθένης καὶ Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικός, Κλε-
άνθης τε [ὁ Ποντικός] καὶ Σφαῖρος ὁ Στωικός, πρὸς δὲ
Παυσανίας ὁ κληθεὶς Ἡρακλειτιστής, Νικομήδης τε καὶ 5
Διονύσιος· τῶν δὲ γραμματικῶν Διόδωτος, ὃς οὐ φησι
περὶ φύσεως εἶναι τὸ σύγγραμμα ἀλλὰ περὶ πολιτείας,
τὰ δὲ περὶ φύσεως ἐν παραδείγματος εἶδει κεῖσθαι.
46W 16 Ἱερώνυμος δὲ φησι καὶ Σκυθῖνον τὸν τῶν ἰάμβων
ποιητὴν ἐπιβαλέσθαι τὸν ἐκείνου λόγον διὰ μέτρου
ἐκβάλλειν. 10

1–5 *Heraclid. Pont.* F 39 Wehrli 2 *Antisth.* 66 A1 DK, cf. *D.L.* 6.19 =
5 A 38 SSR 2, *DPhA* 1 (1989) A 218 2–3 *Cleanthes*: *om. SVF* 1, cf. *D.L.*
7.174, *F* 519 *SVF* 1 3 *Sphaerus*: *om. SVF* 1, cf. *D.L.* 7.178 4 *Paus-*
anias 19 RE 18.2 2405 *Nicomedes* 13 RE 17.1 500 5 *Dionysius*
DPhA 2 (1994) D 169 *Diodotus DPhA* 2 (1994) D 135, cf. *D.L.* 9.12, →

Pythagoras

50 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 8.21

Hieronymus says that Pythagoras descended into Hades and saw both Hesiod's soul bound to a bronze column and screeching, and Homer's hanging from a tree and surrounded by snakes, all in return for what they had said about the gods; and he also saw those who refused intercourse with their own wives being punished; and for this reason, he was honored by the people of Croton.¹

From Diogenes' "Life of Pythagoras" (8.1–50); cf. 8.41 from Hermippus (F 20 Wehrli). The likely source of this report is *On Citharodes* (= *On Poets* 5), in a discussion either of Homer and Hesiod, or of Orphic verse (cf. **61A–B**). A verse narrative entitled *Descent into Hades* which circulated under the name of Orpheus was ascribed to various Pythagoreans (Orph. 1 A 1 and 1b DK, Cercops 15 DK including Arist. F 7 Rose); see West (1983) 9–12, Gottschalk 118–21 (on Heraclides F 74–5). Some (including Ion of Chios 36 B 2 DK; cf. Hdt. 2.81) ascribed Orphic verse to Pythagoras himself (cf. Pythag. 14 A 17–19 DK); see W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism* (1972) 125–31, 155–9.

Heraclitus

51 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 9.15–16

A great many people have explicated his book: both Antisthenes and Heracleides of Pontus, Cleanthes and Sphaerus the Stoic, also Pausanias who is called the Heraclitist, Nicomedes and Dionysius, and among grammarians, Diodotus, who says the book is not about nature but about government, and the material about nature is there
16 to give examples. Hieronymus says Scythinus the iambic poet tried to put his writing into verse.

From Diogenes' "Life of Heraclitus" (9.1–17). Hieronymus' report may come from a discussion of Heraclitus, or of the poet Scythinus (probably fourth century BCE), who also wrote Orphic or Pythagorizing verse.

Suda δ400 8–9 Scythinus 6 A 2 Diels = T 1 West = 13 T 2 FGrH, cf. 22 C 3 DK

3 ὁ Ποντικὸς *del. Huebner* 4 Ἡρακλειτιστῆς *PF*: Ἡρακλείτης τῆς *B*: Ἡρακλείδης *D* 7 εἶδει *BPD*: ἤδη *F* 9 ἐπιβαλέσθαι *D*: ἐπιβάλλεσθαι *BP*: ἐπιβάλλεσθαι *F* διὰ μέτρου *BP*: ἐκ διαμέτρου *F*: κατὰ μέτρον *D* 10 ἐκβάλλειν *BPD*: ἐκβαλεῖν *FP*²

Empedocles

- 52** Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 8.57–8 (BT t. 1 p. 608.16–609.9 Marcovich)

30W 57 Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν τῷ Σοφιστῇ φησι πρῶτον Ἐμπεδοκλέα ῥητορικὴν εὐρεῖν, Ζήνωνα δὲ διαλεκτικὴν. ἐν δὲ τῷ Περὶ ποιητῶν φησιν ὅτι καὶ Ὀμηρικὸς ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ δεινὸς περὶ τὴν φράσιν γέγονεν, μεταφορητικός τε ὢν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς περὶ ποιητικὴν ἐπιτεύγμασι χρώμενος· καὶ διότι γράψαντος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἄλλα ποιήματα, τὴν τε Ξέρξου διάβασιν καὶ προοίμιον εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα, ταῦθ' ὕστερον κατέκασεν ἀδελφῇ τις αὐτοῦ (ἡ θυγάτηρ, ὡς φησιν Ἱερώνυμος), τὸ μὲν προοίμιον ἄκουσα, τὰ δὲ Περσικὰ βουλευθεῖσα διὰ τὸ ἀτελείωτα εἶναι. 10
58 καθόλου δέ φησι καὶ τραγωδίας αὐτὸν γράψαι καὶ πολιτικούς. Ἡρακλείδης δ' ὁ τοῦ Σαραπίωνος ἐτέρου φησὶν εἶναι τὰς τραγωδίας· Ἱερώνυμος δὲ τρισὶ καὶ τετταράκοντά φησιν ἐντετυχηκέναι, Νεάνθης δὲ νέον ὄντα γεγραφέναι τὰς τραγωδίας καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπτὰ ἐντετυχηκέναι. 15

1–15 *Emped. 50 T 2 TGrF 1* (cf. 238 p. 189 Snell) 1–2 *Arist. F 65 Rose = Emped. 31 A 1.57* (cf. A 19) *DK = Zeno El. 29 A 10a DK* 2–12 *Arist. F 70 Rose* 7 Ἀπόλλωνα: cf. *Menander Rhet. 1.2* (333.12–15 *Spengel*) et 1.5 (337.1–9 *Spengel*) = *Emped. 31 A 23 DK, Ammon. In De Interp. 13* (CAG 4.5 249.1–11) = 31 B 134 *DK* 11–15 *Neanthes 84 F 27 FGrH*; cf. *D.L. 8.77, Suda ε 1001* (s.v. Ἐμπεδοκλῆς, sc. θυγατριδὴς *philosophi*) 12–13 *Heraclid. Lemb. F 6e FHG 3.169*

1 ἐν τῷ σοφιστῇ *om. F* 6 διότι *FP*: δὴ ὅτι *B* 7 Ξέρξου *BP*: τοῦ Ξέρξου *FDP*² 11–12 πολιτικούς: πολιτικά *Rose* 15 αὐτὸς *Cobet*: αὐτὸν *codd.*: αὐτῶν *Diels* ἐπτὰ *Diels*: ἔπειτα *codd.*

Socrates

- 53A** Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 2.26 (BT t. 1 p. 109.8–17 Marcovich)

45W 26 φησὶ δὲ Ἀριστοτέλης δύο γυναῖκας αὐτὸν ἀγαγέσθαι, προτέραν μὲν Ξανθίππην, ἐξ ἧς αὐτῷ γενέσθαι Λαμπρο-

Empedocles

52 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 8.57–8

- 57 Aristotle says in the *Sophist* that Empedocles discovered rhetoric first, and Zeno dialectic. In *On Poets* he says that Empedocles is both Homeric and also clever in his diction, since he makes good use of metaphors and the other poetic devices. And Aristotle tells why, although he had also written other poems — *The Invasion of Xerxes* and a *Hymn to Apollo* — a sister of his (or daughter, as Hieronymus says) later burned these, the hymn unintentionally but
58 the Persian work deliberately because it was unfinished.¹ In general, Aristotle says he also wrote tragedies and political discourses. But Heraclides son of Sarapion says the tragedies are by someone else; and Hieronymus says he has read 43, while Neanthes says the tragedies were written in his youth and he himself has read seven.²

From Diogenes' "Life of Empedocles" (8.51–77). The focus on poetic texts suggests that Hieronymus discussed Empedocles in *On Poets*, perhaps in the book *On Tragedians* (cf. 42A); but his *Historical Notes* is also plausible.

¹ On these two poems, see D. Sider, "Empedocles' *Persika*," *Ancient Philosophy* 2 (1982) 76–7; F. Solmsen, "Empedocles' Hymn to Apollo," *Phronesis* 25 (1980) 219–27.

² Clearly, a number of tragedies circulated under Empedocles' name in the third century BCE. But Heraclides Lembus, who in the next century produced epitomes of the *Lives* by both Satyrus and Hermippus (both covered Empedocles), denied their authenticity; and the *Suda* assigns 24 tragedies to Empedocles' homonymous grandson (ε 1001, immediately preceding the main entry on Empedocles, ε 1002 = 31A2 DK). Hieronymus may also have denied their authenticity.

Socrates

53A Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 2.26

- 26 Aristotle says Socrates took two wives: first Xanthippe, who bore him Lamprocles, and second Myrto the daughter of Aristides

κλέα, δευτέραν δὲ Μυρτώ, τὴν Ἀριστείδου τοῦ δικαίου
 θυγατέρα, ἣν καὶ ἄπροικον λαβεῖν, ἐξ ἧς γενέσθαι Σω-
 φρονίσκον καὶ Μενέξενον. οἱ δὲ προτέραν γῆμαι τὴν 5
 Μυρτώ φασιν. ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ ἀμφοτέρας ἔχειν ὁμοῦ, ὧν
 ἐστὶ Σάτυρός τε καὶ Ἱερώνυμος ὁ Ῥόδιος· φασὶ γὰρ βου-
 ληθέντας Ἀθηναίους διὰ τὸ λειπανδρεῖν συναυξῆσαι
 τὸ πλῆθος, ψηφίσασθαι γαμεῖν μὲν ἀστὴν μίαν, παι-
 δοποιεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ ἐξ ἐτέρας· ὅθεν τοῦτο ποιῆσαι καὶ 10
 Σωκράτην.

1–5 *Arist. F 93a Rose = Soc. I B 7a SSR I, Suda σ 829 (s.v. Σωκράτης);*
cf. Cyrillus C. Julian. 6 186–7 = Aristox. F 54a Wehrli = Porph. F 215
Smith = Socrates I B 44 = G 53 SSR I, Theodoret. Graec. aff. cur. 12.64
= Aristox. F 54b Wehrli = Porph. F 215 Smith = Socrates I B 45 SSR
I, Hieron. Adv. Iovin. 1.48 = Seneca F 62 Haase = Socrates I G 90 SSR
I, Soc. Ep. 29.3, [Luc.] Halcyon 8 2–5 cf. Plat. Ap. 34D, Phaedo
116B 6–11 Satyrus F 15 FHG 3.163 8–11 Suda λ 377 (s.v.
λειπανδρεῖν), cf. Gell. NA 15.20.6 9 ἀστὴν: πολὶτιν Aristox. F
54a–b 10 ἐτέρας: ἐταίρας Suda λ 377

4 ἐξ ἧς γενέσθαι *BP*: γενέσθαι δὲ ἐξ αὐτῆς *F* 6 ἔχειν: σχεῖν *Cobet*
 7 φασὶ *FP*²: φησὶ *BP*

3B Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.2 555E–56B (BT t. 3 p. 225.
 25–226.13 Kaibel)

44 W ἐκ τούτων οὖν τις ὁρμώμενος μέμψαιτ' ἂν τοὺς περιτι-
 θέντας Σωκράτει δύο γαμετὰς γυναῖκας, Ξανθίππην καὶ
 τὴν Ἀριστείδου Μυρτώ, οὗ τοῦ δικαίου καλουμένου (οἱ
 χρόνοι γὰρ οὐ συγχωροῦσιν) ἀλλὰ τοῦ τρίτου ἀπ' ἐκεί- 5
 556 νου. εἰσὶ δὲ Καλλιस्थένης, Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς, Σάτυ-
 ρος ὁ Περιπατητικός, Ἀριστόξενος, οἷς τὸ ἐνδόσιμον
 Ἀριστοτέλης ἔδωκεν ἱστορῶν τοῦτο ἐν τῷ Περὶ εὐγεν-
 είας· εἰ μὴ ἄρα συγκεχωρημένον κατὰ ψήφισμα τοῦτο
 ἐγένετο τότε διὰ σπάνιν ἀνθρώπων, ὥστ' ἐξεῖναι καὶ δύο 10
 ἔχειν γυναῖκας τὸν βουλόμενον, ὅθεν καὶ τοὺς τῆς κωμω-
 δίας ποιητὰς ἀποσιωπῆσαι τοῦτο, πολλάκις τοῦ Σωκρά-
 τους μνημονεύοντας. παρέθετο δὲ περὶ τῶν γυναικῶν

the Just;¹ he accepted her even without a dowry and she bore him Sophroniscus and Menexenus. Others say he married Myrto first. Some, including Satyrus and Hieronymus of Rhodes, say he had both at the same time;² for they say the Athenians wanted to increase their population because of a shortage of manpower and passed a bill for marrying one citizen and having children from another as well, which is why Socrates did this.³

From Diogenes' "Life of Socrates" (2.18–47). The story of Socrates and Myrto is often dismissed as fictitious; for a critique, see L. Woodbury, "Socrates and the Daughter of Aristides," *Phoenix* 27 (1973) 7–25; for a defense, see K. Döring, "Sokrates," in *Die Philosophie der Antike* 2.1 (1998) 148, 330; cf. R. Crome, "Socrates' Myrto," *Grazer Beiträge* 9 (1980) 57–67, K.R. Walters, "Pericles' Citizenship Law," *Classical Antiquity* 2 (1983) 331–6. Rightly or wrongly, Hieronymus accepted the story and cited legislation to explain it; his aim was evidently apologetic rather than polemical, since the explanation ascribes a patriotic motive to Socrates. The same legislation is cited by Gellius *NA* 15.20.6 to explain Euripides' alleged misogyny (cf. **33**); cf. Arist. *Pol.* 3.5 1278a28–34 on fluctuating standards of legitimacy.

¹ Probably his granddaughter, as in **53C** (from Aristoxenus, according to Woodbury 16), or possibly a great granddaughter, as in **53B**; see J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (1971) 51–2.

² Satyrus, an author of biographical works from the later third century BCE, is probably the intermediate source for all or most of this report.

³ Cf. **28** for a similar use of documents. Evidence for the legal and social status of the two women is conflicting and unclear; see Woodbury 19–24, cf. **42A** n. 1.

53B Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 13.2 555E–556B

"So on this basis, one might reproach those who assign Socrates two wedded wives, Xanthippe and Myrto the daughter of Aristides — not Aristides the "Just," since the dates do not fit, but his grand-son. These are Callisthenes, Demetrius of Phalerum, Satyrus the Peripatetic, Aristoxenus, and Aristotle, who set the tone for them by reporting this in *On Good Family*. But a bill allowed this at that time because of a population shortage, so that it was permissible to have two wives if one wanted; this is why the poets of comedy are silent about this even though they mention Socrates many times. Hieronymus of Rhodes cites a bill on wives, and I will send

Β ψήφισμα Ἱερώννυμος ὁ Ῥόδιος, ὅπερ σοι διαπέμψομαι
εὐπορήσας τοῦ βιβλίου. ἀντεῖπε δὲ τοῖς λέγουσι περὶ
τῶν Σωκράτους γυναικῶν Παναίτιος ὁ Ῥόδιος. 15

1–15 *Socrates I B 58 SSR 1, Demetr. Phal. F 105 SOD = F 94 Wehrli*
= 228 F 45b FGrH, *Callisth. 124 F 43 FGrH, Panaetius F 133 van*
Straaten = 143 Alesse 1–8 *Aristox. F 57 Wehrli = Socrates I B 48*
= B 52 SSR 1, *Arist. F 93c Rose = Socrates I B 7c SSR 1* 5–6 *Satyrus*
cf. F 15 FHG 3.163 = 53A.6–11

[A cum Epitome CE] 12 ante περὶ add. τὸ Meineke, Cobet

53C Plutarchus, *Aristides* 27.2–4 335B–D (BT t. 1.1 p. 286.5–23 Ziegler)

2 καὶ τὰς μὲν θυγατέρας ἱστοροῦσιν ἐκ τοῦ πρυτανείου
τοῖς νυμφίοις ἐκδοθῆναι, δημοσίᾳ τῆς πόλεως τὸν γάμον
ἐγγνώσης καὶ προῖκα τρισχιλίας δραχμᾶς ἑκατέρᾳ
ψηφισαμένης, Λυσιμάχῳ δὲ τῷ υἱῷ μνᾶς μὲν ἑκατὸν
ἀργυρίου καὶ γῆς τοσαῦτα πλῆθρα πεφυτευμένης ἔδωκεν 5
ὁ δῆμος, καὶ ἄλλας δραχμᾶς τέσσαρας εἰς ἡμέραν ἐκάσ-
3 την ἀπέταξεν, Ἀλκιβιάδου τὸ ψήφισμα γράψαντος. ἔτι
δὲ Λυσιμάχου θυγατέρα Πολυκρίτην ἀπολιπόντος, ὥς
43W Καλλισθένης φησί, καὶ ταύτη σίτησιν ὅσῃν τοῖς Ὀλυμ- 10
πιονίκαις ὁ δῆμος ἐψηφίσατο. Δημήτριος δ' ὁ Φαληρεὺς
καὶ Ἱερώννυμος ὁ Ῥόδιος καὶ Ἀριστόξενος ὁ μουσικὸς
καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης (εἶγε δὴ τὸ Περὶ εὐγενείας βιβλίον ἐν
τοῖς γνησίοις Ἀριστοτέλους θετέον) ἱστοροῦσι Μυρτῶ
θυγατριδὴν Ἀριστείδου Σωκράτει τῷ σοφῷ συνοικῆσαι,
γυναῖκα μὲν ἑτέραν ἔχοντι, ταύτην δ' ἀναλαβόντι 15
χηρεύουσιν διὰ πενίαν καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαιῶν ἐνδεομένην.
4 πρὸς μὲν οὖν τούτους ἱκανῶς ὁ Παναίτιος ἐν τοῖς περὶ
Σωκράτους ἀντεῖρηκεν.

1–10 *Callisth. 124 F 48 FGrH* 1–4 *cf. Plut. Arist. 1.1–2, Aeschines*
Or. 3.258, Nepos Arist. 3.3 4–7 *cf. Demosth. Or. 20.115* 7–18
Demetr. Phal. F 104 SOD = 96 Wehrli = 228 F 45 FGrH 10–16
Arist. F 93b Rose = Socrates I B 7b = B 57 SSR 1 10–18 *Aristox. F*
58 Wehrli = Socrates I B 49 SSR 1, Panaetius F 132 van Straaten = 142
Alesse, Socrates I B 54 SSR 1 →

it to you when I get his book.¹ Panaetius of Rhodes controverted those who talk about the wives of Socrates.”

From Book 13 “On women” (cf. **33**); the host Larensis, who introduces the topic (555B, cf. 558E) by citing Spartan marital customs and the mythical origin of monogamy in Athens (Clearchus F 73 Wehrli), defends Socrates, then contrasts barbarian customs of royal “concubines” (παλλακίδες; cf. **42A** n. 1) with Greek legends of wives hostile to rivals.

¹ Athenaeus may mean that he has read Hieronymus, or simply another work (Satyrus?) that cited him.

53C Plutarch, *Aristides* 27.2–4

- 2 They report that Aristides’ daughters were presented to their grooms at the Prytaneum, since the city officially sponsored their marriage and voted a dowry of 3000 drachmas for each. To his son Lysimachus the Assembly granted 100 minas of silver and as many acres of planted land, and another four drachmas as a daily stipend,
- 3 in a bill proposed by Alcibiades. Further, when Lysimachus died leaving a daughter Polycrite, as Callisthenes says, the Assembly granted her as well the same meals they grant Olympic victors. Demetrius of Phalerum, Hieronymus of Rhodes, Aristoxenus the musicologist, and Aristotle (if in fact the book *On Good Family* should be counted among his genuine works) report that Myrto, a granddaughter of Aristides, cohabited with Socrates the wise; he had another wife but accepted this one too since she was an indi-
- 4 gent widow and needed support.¹ Now these people Panaetius has controverted adequately in *On Socrates*.

Plutarch concludes his Life of Aristides by describing how Athens honored him after death by granting his family extraordinary honors.

¹ This explanation for Socrates’ two “wives” is consistent with the one ascribed to Hieronymus in **53A–B**, though it may come from another of the sources Plutarch names.

[ASU] 1 μὲν UA: μὲν οὖν S 5 post πλέθρα add. καὶ ψιλῆς καὶ Sauppe e Demosth. 6 καὶ ἄλλας S: ἄλλας δὲ UA 9 ὅσην S: ὅσην καὶ UA 12 εἶγε δὴ τὸ Ziegler: εἰ δὴ τὸ γε S: εἰ δὴ τὸ UA

De Socraticis

Phaedo

- 54** Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 2.105 (BT t. 1 p. 163.5–10 Marcovich)

24W 105 Φαίδων Ἡλείος, τῶν εὐπατριδῶν, συνεάλω τῇ πατρ-
ίδι καὶ ἠναγκάσθη στήναι ἐπ' οἰκήματος· ἀλλὰ τὸ
θύριον προστιθεὶς μετεῖχε Σωκράτους, ἕως αὐτὸν λυτρώ-
σασθαι τοὺς περὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην ἢ Κρίτωνα προύτρεψε·
καὶ τοὺν τεύθεν ἐλευθερίως ἐφιλοσόφει. Ἱερώνυμος δ' ἐν 5
τῷ Περὶ ἐποχῆς καθαπτόμενος δοῦλον αὐτὸν εἴρηκε.

1–6 *Phaedo* 3 A 1a SSR 1, cf. *Suda* φ 154 (s.v. *Phaedo*) = 3 A 1b SSR 1, *D.L.* 2.31 = 3 A 2a SSR 1, *Orig. C. Celsum* 1.64 = 3 A 2c SSR 1, 3.67 = 3 A 2d SSR 1, *Julian. Ep.* 59 445A = 3 A 2b SSR 1; *Gell. NA* 2.18.3 = 3 A 3a SSR 1, *Lact. Div. Inst.* 3.25.15 = 3 A 3c SSR 1, *Hieron. Comm. in Osee* 1.1 = 3 A 3b SSR 1, [*Hesych.*] *Vir. illustr.* 70 2–3 cf. *Aeschines Or.* 1.74 6 δοῦλον : cf. *servus Gell. NA* 2.18.3, *Lact. Div. Inst.* 3.25.15; παρθεὶς πορνοβοσκῶ τινι *Suda* φ 154, [*Hesych.*]

[BPF] 2–3 τὸ θύριον προστιθεὶς : τῷ θυρίῳ προστεθεὶς *Casaubon*
3 προστιθεὶς : προσθεὶς *Kuehn* μετεῖχε Σωκράτους : μετῆλθε
Σωκράτην *Casaubon* 4 ἢ BP : καὶ F 6 ἐποχῆς : συνοχῆς *Gigante*

Discipulus Platonis Anonyma

- 55** Anonymus = *POxy.* 3656 (t. 52 p. 49 Parsons)

- * διήκουσε δὲ με-
τὰ τὴν Πλάτωνος
τελευτὴν καὶ Σπεν-

On Socratics

Phaedo

54 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 2.105

105 Phaedo of Elis, who came from a patrician family, was taken captive when his city was captured¹ and compelled to work in a house.¹ But he would close the door and talk to Socrates, until Socrates convinced the friends of Alcibiades or Crito to buy his freedom. Henceforth he philosophized in freedom. Hieronymus in *On Suspension* has said in derision that he was a slave.

From Diogenes' "Life of Phaedo" (2.105): the story of his "conversion" to philosophy; cf. Alcibiades in Plato's *Symp.* and Polemo in Antigonos of Carystus F 9. The basic story is probably historical; see E. I. McQueen and C. Rowe, "Phaedo, Socrates, and the Chronology of the Spartan War with Elis," *Methexis* 2 (1989) 1–18, cf. S. Dušanić, "Phaedo's Enslavement and Liberation," *Illinois Classical Studies* 18 (1993) 83–97. The title of the work in which Hieronymus reported Phaedo's brief servitude probably refers to the "suspension of judgment" associated with Arcesilaus and his "New Academy" (cf. 4–5, 7, 34; but see 25 n. 1); a work on Academic scepticism, whether critical or not, would invite discussion of the Socratic heritage, including Plato and other Socratics (cf. 55); see Arrighetti 117–20, R. Bett, "Reactions to Aristotle in the Greek Sceptical Traditions," *Methexis* 12 (1999) 17–34 (at 21 n. 15), and H. Gottschalk in this volume.

¹ Probably in 402/1, when Phaedo was an ephebe (cf. Plato *Phaedo* 89B–C); see McQueen and Rowe 4–13.

² Phaedo's "work in a house" (literally "stand in a building"), though possibly benign (menial service in a home or workshop; or held for ransom as a war captive, cf. LSJ s.v. οἴκημα II.5), almost certainly refers to forced prostitution in a brothel (see D.L. 2.31, *Suda* φ 154, Aeschines *Or.* 1.74; cf. LSJ s.v. οἴκημα II.1); for background, see D. Halperin, "The Democratic Body: Prostitution and Citizenship in Classical Athens," in his *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* (1990) 88–112 and 180–90, cf. J. Davidson, *Courtesans and Fishcakes* (1997) 78–91.

Anonymous Student of Plato

55 Anonymous, *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* 3656

After Plato's death, she studied with Speusippus too, according

- σίππου, καθὰ λέγει
 5 ὁ Ἰππόβοτος, αὐθις δὲ
 καὶ Μενεδήμου τοῦ
 Ἑρετρικοῦ. ἀ[υθις] ῥηγήσατο δὲ
 περὶ αὐτῆς καὶ Ἱερῶ-
 νυμος ὁ Ῥόδιος ἐν
 10 τῷ Περὶ συνοχῆς
 συνγράμματι. ἰστο-
 ρεῖ δ' Ἀριστοφάνης
 ὁ Περιπατητικὸς
 ὁμοίως ἐν τῷ Περὶ
 15 ἀλυσπίας τὴν μίρα-
 κα ὠραίαν χαρίτων
 τε ἀνεπιτηδεύτων
 πλήρη οὔσαν νεα-

= CPF 1.1.2 61 T 1 1-4 cf. D.L. 4.2 = Speusippus T 1 Tarán, Ath. 7
 279E-F = Speusippus T 39a Tarán, Ath. 12 546D = Speusippus T 39b
 Tarán, D.L. 3.46 = Dicaearchus F 44 Wehrli = 50 Mirhady 5
 Hippobotus F 6a Gigante (vid. Gigante, Parola del Passato 220 [1985]
 69), cf. DPhA 3 (2000) H 148 1-7 Menedemus 3 F 25 SSR 1 7-
 19 Aristophanes CPF 1.1.1 23 T 1, cf. DPhA 1 (1989) A 404

10 συνοχῆς: ἐποχῆς Gottschalk 12 Ἀριστοφάνης: Ἀριστόξενος
 Gigante

56 Philodemus *De Stoicis* 1 = *PHerc.* 339 col. 8.1-19 Dorandi

- 47W . [. .] α [. .] πο[λ]λάκις ἐξ[— — —
 θη πάντα λέγομεν, Ἱερώνυ-
 μός τε μαρτυρεῖ κ[αὶ] ὁ Χαλκιδεὺς
 Εὐφαντος, ἔτι δ' Ἠγήμων ὁ [— — —
 5 ναιος καὶ Ἀ[πολλόδωρος ὁ γραμ-
 μα[τικ]ός· εἰ[. .] ε καὶ [. . . .] υνη
 κως καὶ βουλόμεν[ο]ς [ε]ῖναι τοῦ
 Βαβυλωνίου μαθητῆς [. .] α [. . . .] υ
 τοις λέ[γ]ει χο[— — —] σκα[.
 10 . [. . . .] ν τοίνυν οὐ[δ]ὲ τοῦ Κιτι-
 έως [έσ]τιν ἔ'πιστολὴ πρὸς {τὴν}
 τὴν ου[.] μενην ἀντιφω

to Hippobotus,¹ and then also with Menedemus of Eretria. Hieronymus of Rhodes also told about her in his book *On Constraint*; and Aristophanes the Peripatetic reports likewise in *On Painlessness*² that in her teens she was lovely and full of unstudied grace ...

An isolated papyrus fragment on the early Academy. The student is probably either Axiothea of Phlius or Lasthenia of Mantinea; see T. Dorandi, "Assiotea e Lastenia: due donne all' Accademia," *Atti e memorie dell' Accademia Toscana di scienze e lettere* 54 (1989) 51–66. The title here ascribed to Hieronymus (which could refer rather to "cohesion" or "continuity") is probably an error (authorial or scribal) for the work named in **54**: discussion of the early Academy would be natural in a work on "suspension" (cf. **54** n.); see H. Gottschalk in this volume.

¹ Hippobotus, a historian of philosophy, probably second century BCE.

² This Aristophanes (probably not the great scholar from Byzantium) is otherwise unknown; M. Gigante, *Elenchos* 7 (1987) 59–62 proposes emending to Aristoxenus. The title of his work recalls Hieronymus' ethical theory; see **11–24**.

56 Philodemus, *On the Stoics* 1 (*Herculaneum Papyrus* 339 col. 8.10–19 Dorandi)

... often ... all we say, both Hieronymus and Euphantus of Chalcis attest,¹ and also Hegemon of [...] and Apollodorus the scholar² ... and wanting to be a student of the Babylonian³ ... he says ... then, the letter to [...] is not by the man from Citium⁴ ... about which

- — — τ]ῶν, περὶ [ῶν] λέγειν το
 — — —] δέ τις [. .]ασησαι
 15 — — —]ων
 — — —] καὶ βαρβαρισμὸν [. . .
 ζει μετεώρως τε λoid[ορ]ε[ίται
 . . . τῇ]ς ἡδονῆς ὅπερ ου[— — —
 .]τωι ποιεῖν ἐν ἄλλοι[ς — — —

1–5 *Hieronymus Card.* 154 F 19 FGrH (cf. *Hornblower* 251–4),
Euphantus 74 F 3 FGrH, cf. *D.L.* 2.110 = 2 D 1 SSR 1, *DPhA* 3 (2000)
E 125 *Hegemon ignotus, nec Thasius* RE 7 (1912) 2595 no. 3 *nec*
Alexandrius Troadis RE 7 (1912) 2596 no. 5 *5 Apollodorus*
Athenaeus 244 FGrH *ut videtur, sed fortasse Cyrenaeus* RE 1 (1894)
2886 no. 62 *vel Pergamonensis* RE 1 (1894) 2886 no. 64 7–8 τοῦ
Βαβυλωνίου: *Diogenes Seleuciensis, ut videtur*

1–2 — —]θη πάντα: Κλεάν]θην. ἃ γὰρ *Crönert* 4–5 Ἀθη]ναῖος
suppl. Crönert 6–7 εἰ [δ]ῆ[. ὁμ]ευνητικῶς *Mayer* 8–10
τοιο]ύτοις λέγει κε[χρησθαι τρόποις Κλ[ελάνθη]ν *Mayer* 12–14
οὐ[κέτι εὐρη]μένην ἀντιφώ[νησιν τ]ῶν, περὶ [ῶν] λέγειν τό[τε ἡξίου
suppl. Crönert 16–17 ὁ]ν[εἰδί]ζει *suppl. Crönert* 17–18
[αὐ]τ]ῶι καὶ τῆς *suppl. Crönert* 18–19 οὐ[δαμῶς αὐ]τὸν ποιεῖν
ἐν ἄλλοι[ς δείκνυσιν *suppl. Mayer*

III. INCERTA

Vita

57A Theo Alexandrinus, Vita Arati III (BT p. 14b12–15b32 Martin)

- διέτριψε δὲ παρὰ Ἀντιγόνῳ, ὃς ἐβασίλευσε Μακε-
 δονίας, παρελθούσης τῆς βασιλείας εἰς αὐτὸν τρόπον
 τοῦτον . . . οὗ γίνεται παῖς Δημήτριος ὁ Πολιορκήτης,
 5a W Δημητρίου δ' Ἀντίγονος ὁ Γονατᾶς, παρ' ᾧ διέτριβεν 5
 αὐτὸς καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Περσαῖος ὁ Στωικὸς καὶ Ἀντα-
 γόρας ὁ Ῥόδιος ὁ τὴν Θηβαίδα ποιήσας καὶ Ἀλέξαν-
 δρος ὁ Αἰτωλός, ὡς αὐτός φησιν ὁ Ἀντίγονος ἐν τοῖς
 πρὸς Ἱερώνυμον. ἐπισταθεὶς δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ πρῶτον μὲν
 αὐτῷ ποίημα ἀνέγνω τὸ Εἰς τὸν Πᾶνα τὸν Ἀρκαδίας, εἴτ'

[they?] say... and barbarism ... and makes lofty insults ... of pleasure, which ... doing in other ...

A lacunose discussion of Zeno of Citium in an Epicurean polemic against the Stoics; preceding columns address chronological details in Zeno's life, and subsequent columns attack his *Republic* as Cynical and immoral. The immediate context is obscure but the reference to a letter suggests it may involve Zeno's relations with Macedonia; cf. **57A**. Philodemus refers to Hieronymus of Rhodes in **38A** but not to the historian from Cardia in any extant work.

¹ Euphantus of Olynthus, student of the megaric Euboulides, contemporary of Alexinus and Diodorus Cronus, and teacher of the young Antigonos II Gonatas (c. 319–239; cf. **4**, **57A**), to whom he dedicated a work *On Kingship* (D.L. 2.110); he also wrote a history of his era.

² This Hegemon is unknown. Apollodorus “the grammarian” (cf. D.L. 8.52) is probably the second-century Athenian scholar; see Dorandi, *Stoicis* 113.

³ Apparently Diogenes of Babylon (or Seleuceia), Stoic scholarch in the mid-second century BC and teacher of Apollodorus.

⁴ Apparently a denial that a letter ascribed to Zeno is authentic; cf. the pair of letters in D.L. 7.7–9, in which King Antigonos II Gonatas invites Zeno to join him in Pella, but Zeno declines and sends Persaeus in his stead (cf. **57A** n.). The reference to “barbarism” in line 16 may be from a stylistic argument against authenticity.

III. UNCERTAIN

Life

57A Theon of Alexandria, “Life of Aratus” III

He [sc. Aratus] stayed with Antigonos, who was king of Macedonia, the throne having come to him this way: ... ; his son was Demetrius Poliorcetes, and Demetrius' son was Antigonos Gonatas,¹ with whom he himself [sc. Aratus] stayed, and with him Persaeus the Stoic, Antagoras of Rhodes who wrote the *Thebaid*, and Alexander of Aetolia,² as Antigonos himself says in his writings to Hieronymus.³ After being stationed with the king, he [sc. Aratus] first read for him the poem “To Pan of Arcadia”; then at the

ἐκείνου κελεύσαντος ἔγραψε τὰ Φαινόμενα.

10

4–8 *Hieronymus Card.* 154 T 9 FGrH 4–10 *Aratus F* 115 SH 5
 αὐτὸς, sc. *Aratus*: cf. *Vita I* (7.25–8.11 *Martin*), *Vita IV* (19.5–7 *Martin*),
Pausanias 1.2.3, *Suda* α 3745 (s.v. Ἄρατος), *D.L.* 2.133 = *Menedemus*
 3 F 12 SSR 1 = *Antig. Caryst.* F 29 *Dorandi* *Persaeus* om. SVF, cf.
Vita IV (20.3–7 *Martin*) = F 440 SVF 1, *D.L.* 7.6–9 = F 439, 7.36 = F
 435 (cf. *Them. Or.* 32 358A–D = F 449), 2.143 = F 460, 4.46–7 = F 459
Antagoras F 4 *Powell* 6 *Alex. Aet.* T 5a *Magnelli*

[ET] 1 διέτριψε *Ruhnken*: διέπρεψε *codd.* 4 Γονατᾶς *edd.*:
 γονάτας *T*: γαλάτας *E* 5 αὐτὸς *E*: αὐτός τε Ἄρατος *T* Περσαῖος
Hemsterhuys: Περσεὺς *codd.* 8 πρὸς *Ruhnken*: περὶ *codd.* Ἱερωνύ-
 μου *coni. Jacoby*

57B Aratus Latinus, Vita Arati (p. 146b13–148b9 Maas)

permansit autem apud Antigonom regem Macedonum,
 transeunte regno in ipsum sicuti hunc: ... cuius fit puer
 5b W Demetrius Obsessor, Demetrii autem Antigonus Genicu-
 losus, apud quem frequentabat ut Perseus Stoicus et Anta-
 goras Rodius, qui Thebaida fecit, et Alexander Aetolus, ut
 ipse ait Antigonus apud quem Hieronimus. adsistens
 quidem regis primum vero illi carmen exposuit apud Pana 5

king's command, he wrote the *Phenomena*.

From an abbreviated "Life" of the poet Aratus, based on an exegetical work by Theon of Alexandria, probably the late 1st-century BCE scholar (J. Martin, *Histoire du texte des Phénomènes d'Aratos* [1956] 157–204), but possibly the fourth-century CE astronomer (A. Cameron, *Callimachus and His Critics* [1995] 194–8). The context suggests a letter from Antigonos, probably in the 270s, inviting Hieronymus to join him at his court in Pella; cf. D.L. 7.6–9 for an invitation to Zeno (possibly apocryphal, cf. 56 n. 4). But the identity of this Hieronymus is uncertain. Mention of a philosopher and three learned poets (including the Stoicizing Aratus and a Rhodian) suits the Peripatetic, and Antigonos may have included letters with the funds he "sent" (ἀπέστειλεν) to Athens for the annual gatherings hosted by Hieronymus (4.10–14); cf. Wehrli 30. But Antigonos also had close ties to Hieronymus of Cardia, who had served the Macedonian court since the 290s and whose history of Alexander's successors extended into the early years of Antigonos' reign (to 272); cf. Hornblower 15.

¹ Antigonos II Gonatas (c. 320–239), son of Demetrius I "Besieger" (336–283; the epithet evokes his failed siege of Rhodes in 305–4) and named after his grandfather Antigonos I "One-Eyed" (382–301), recovered the throne by 276; for a family stemma, see *DPhA* 1 (1989) A 194. The brief passage omitted conflates the story of his accession with his genealogy.

² Antigonos frequented philosophers and poets when in Athens and invited several to his court in Pella; see Tarn 223–56. Aratus arrived c. 276 and Persaeus probably about the same time; cf. A. Grilli, "Zenone e Antigono II," *RIFC* 91 (1963) 287–301. The poet Antagoras had close ties to several Academics, including Polemo and Crantor (D.L. 4.21, 26–7); Alexander was a tragedian and editor of tragedy in the Alexandrian library.

³ "Antigonos himself" refers to Gonatas, not the biographer from Carystus. According to the received text, he wrote "about" Hieronymus; but the manuscripts are rife with corruption, and editors emend to have Antigonos write "to" him, presumably in a letter.

57B *Latin Aratus*, "Life of Aratus"

He stayed with Antigonos, king of the Macedonians, the throne coming to him like this: ...;¹ his son was Demetrius the Besieger, and Demetrius' son was Antigonos Geniculosis, with whom he spent time, as did Persaeus the Stoic, Antagoras of Rhodes who wrote the *Thebaid*, and Alexander of Aetolia, as Antigonos himself says with whom Hieronymus. While attending the king, first he delivered to him a song "With Arcadian Pan"; at his command, he

Arcadiensem; idem ipso iubente scripsit ea quae videntur.

5 *Alex. Aet. T 5b Magnelli*

4 ut *Maass*: ei *codd.*

58 IG 12.1 141 = GVI 1916

- γ]ρά[μμ]α[τ]· ἐδίδαξεν ἔτεα πεν[τήκ]ον[θ]· ὅδε
 δύο τ' ἐπὶ τούτοις, καὶ εὐσεβῶν [χ]ῶρός [σφ] ἔχει.
 Πλούτων γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ Κόρη κα[τ]ώικισ[αν]
 'Ε]ρμῆς τε καὶ δαιδοῦχος Ἑκάτ[η] προσφιλῇ
 5 ἅπασιν εἶναι μυστικῶν τε [ἐ]πιστ[άτην]
 ἔταξαν αὐτὸν πίστεως πά[σ]ης χ[ά]ριν.

αὐτὸς ἐσελθὼν, ξεῖνε, σαφῶς μ[ά]θε, [πό]σσα μαθητῶν
 π]λήθη τοὺς πολιοὺς στέψαν ἐμοῦ[ς] κ[ρο]τάφους.

Cf. 2, Hiller-Robert 140–2, F. Hiller, "Ardeikes und Hieronymos von Rhodos," BCH 36 (1912) 230–9, U. Wilamowitz, Archaeol. Anzeig. (1913) 43, F. Hiller, Götting. Gel. Anz. (1942) 204, Arrighetti 124–7

1 *suppl. Kaibel* 2 *suppl. Wilamowitz*: [χ]ορὸν [μό]λε Peek 4
suppl. Kaibel 7 *suppl. Wilamowitz*: πόσσα πολιτῶν *Kaibel*: πῶς
 αἰζηῶν *vel* παίδων ὅσ(σ)α *coni. Peek*, "Platz nur für 8 Buchstaben"
 8 *suppl. Hiller*

Rhodiaca [cf. Ἡλιακά]

59A Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 2.30 48B (BT t. 1 p. 112.7–13 *Kaibel*)

- 48W ἥκμασε δ' ἡ τῶν ποικίλων ὑφή, μάλιστα ἐντέχνων
 περὶ αὐτὰ γενομένων Ἀκεσᾶ καὶ Ἑλικῶνος τῶν Κυπρ-
 ῶν. ὑφάνται δ' ἦσαν ἔνδοξοι· καὶ ἦν Ἑλικῶν υἱὸς
 Ἀκεσᾶ, ὥς φησιν Ἱερώνυμος. ἐν Πυθοὶ γοῦν ἐπὶ τινος
 ἔργου ἐπιγέγραπται·
 τεῦξ' Ἑλικῶν Ἀκεσᾶ Σαλαμίνιος, ᾧ ἐνὶ χερσὶ

wrote “Those that appear.”

From a late (7th-8th century) and barbarous Latin translation of the Greek “Life” which accompanied Latin versions of Aratus; see E. Maas (1898) xxxi–xliv, J. Martin, *Histoire du texte des Phénomènes d’Aratos* (1956) 38–50.

1 Cf. **57A** n. 2.

58 Epitaph from Rhodes = *Greek Inscriptions* 12.1 141

Letters he taught for fifty years plus two,
and a chorus of holy ones holds him now.
For Pluto and the Maiden gave him a home,
and Hermes and torch-bearing Hecate assigned
him to be dear to all and overseer of secret rites
in grateful return for his total fidelity.

When you enter, stranger, know thou well how many
ranks of students crowned my gray-haired brow.

An inscription on a small marble base found south of the city of Rhodes. A hole in the top once held a tombstone, which presumably recorded the name of the deceased, which is otherwise strangely absent from the epitaph. Hiller-Robert 141–2 note parallels between the epitaph and the relief on **2**: lines 1–2 and 7–8 with the school-scene on the left, and lines 3–6 with the underworld-scene on the right (see p. 476); but for serious doubts, see Arrighetti 124–7.

Rhodes

59A Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 2.30 48B

The weaving of figured cloth reached its peak after the Cypriots Acesas and Helicon perfected the art.¹ They were famous weavers, and Helicon was a son of Acesas, according to Hieronymus; at Delphi, at any rate, there is a work bearing an inscription:

Made by Helicon son of Acesas from Salamis, whose hands

πότνια θεσπεσίην Παλλὰς ἔχευε χάριν.

1–7 *Eustathius In Od. 1.130* 6–7 *IMG 180 Preger*

[*Epitome CE*] 6 ᾧ *codd.*: ᾧν *Eustathius* 7 ἔχευε *Menrad* (cf. *Od.* 2.12, 8.19, 17.63): ἔτευξε *CE*, *Eustathius*: ἔπνευσε *Kaibel*: ἐπηύξε *Stadtmüller*: ἔτεγξε *Hecker*

59B Zenobius vulgatus, *Proverbia* 1.56 (*CPG* t. 1 p. 22.13–16)

* Ἀκεσέως καὶ Ἑλικῶνος ἔργα — ἐπὶ τῶν θαύματος ἀξίων. οὗτοι γὰρ πρῶτοι τὸν τῆς Πολιάδος Ἀθηνᾶς πέπλον ἐδημιούργησαν, ὁ μὲν Ἀκεσεὺς γένος ᾧν Παταρεύς, ὁ δὲ Ἑλικὼν Καρύστιος.

1–3 *Bodl.* 86 *Gaisford*, *Diogen. vulg.* 2.7 (*CPG* 1.197), *Macar.* 1.67 (*CPG* 2.140–1), *Apost.* 1.99 (*CPG* 2.265)

[*P* = *Parisinus* 3070, s. xii] 1 Ἀκεσέως *Schneidewin*, *Bodl.*: Ἀκέσεως *P*: Ἀκεσαίου *Diogen. vulg.* 2 Πολιάδος: Παλλάδος *Bodl.*: om. *Macar.* 3 ἐδημιούργησαν: εἰργάσαντο *Macar.* ἦν δὲ ante ὁ *Bodl.* 3–4 ᾧν Παταρεύς: Παταρῶν *Bodl.*

59C Plutarchus, *Alexander* 32.8–11 684B–C (BT t. 2.2 p. 197.10–22 Ziegler)

* ταῦτ' ἐπιστείλας Παρμενίωνι, τὸ κράνος περιέθετο, τὸν δ' ἄλλον ὀπλισμὸν εὐθύς ἀπὸ σκηνῆς εἶχεν, ὑπένδυμα τῶν Σικελικῶν ζωστόν, ἐπὶ δὲ τούτῳ θώρακα διπλοῦν λινοῦν ἐκ τῶν ληφθέντων ἐν Ἰσῳ. τὸ δὲ κρά- 5 νος ἦν μὲν σιδηροῦν, ἔστιλβε δ' ὥσπερ ἄργυρος καθ- 5 αρός, ἔργον Θεοφίλου· συνήρμοστο δ' αὐτῷ περιτρα- 5 χήλιον ὁμοίως σιδηροῦν, λιθοκόλλητον· μάχαιραν δὲ

Lady Athena imbued with godly grace.

Book 2, on drinking customs, is preserved only in an epitome; the context here concerns the use of blankets on couches at symposia. Wehrli, *Hieronimos* 42 ascribes this to the Rhodian for three reasons: the use of documentary evidence (cf. **53A–B**), the Rhodian source of Alexander's mantle in **59C**, and the report on Alexander in **30**. The two reports on Alexander are less likely to come from Hieronymus of Cardia, whose *Histories of the Successors* recounted the 50 years after Alexander's death; but cf. **62**.

¹ When Acesas and Helicon were active is unknown. They are commonly dated to the fifth century on the basis of presumed ties to the Panathenaea in **59B**.

59B Zenobius, *Proverbs* 1.56

“Works of Acesas and Helicon”: of things worthy of marvel, since these men were the first to produce the gown for Athena Polias; Acesas came from Patara, Helicon from Carystus.¹

On Zenobius, see **42C**. Although **59A** and **B** assign the weavers different origins, this votive gown provides a plausible link to Hieronymus: the *Lindos Chronicle*, which cites a Hieronymus (see **60A–B**), records gifts to Athena Polias at Lindos (*ILind* 2, votives 1–2 and 4–6, all from before the fall of Troy), where the title Polias replaced Lindios early in the third century BC. Alternatively, he may have discussed an Athenian votive in his *Historical Notes* or *Miscellaneous Notes*: although small gowns were produced annually for the Panathenaea were woven by Athenian women (probably for Athena Polias), much larger gowns woven by men were dedicated at the quadrennial Panathenaea (but to Athena Parthenos?); see E. Barber, “The Peplos of Athena,” and B. Ridgway, “Images of Athena on the Akropolis,” in *Goddess and Polis: the Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, ed. J. Neils (Princeton 1992) 103–17 and 119–42.

¹ Lycian Patara (due East of Rhodes) and Euboean Carystus.

59C Plutarch, *Alexander* 32.8–11

After he [sc. Alexander] sent this message to Parmenio, he put on his helmet; the rest of his gear he had already put on in his tent: a belted tunic made by Sicilians, and over this a quilted linen breastplate from the spoils taken at Issus. The helmet was made of iron but glistened like pure silver; it was made by Theophilus. To it he fastened a collar likewise of iron, studded with gems. He car-

θαυμαστὴν βαφῇ καὶ κουφότητι, δωρησαμένου τοῦ
 Κιτιέων βασιλέως, [ἦν] εἶχεν, ἡσκημένος τὰ πολλὰ χρῆ- 10
 σθαι μαχαίρα παρὰ τὰς μάχας. ἐπιπόρπωμα δ' ἐφόρει τῇ
 μὲν ἐργασίᾳ σοβαρώτερον ἢ κατὰ τὸν ἄλλον ὀπλισμόν·
 ἦν γὰρ ἔργον Ἑλικῶνος τοῦ παλαιοῦ, τιμὴ δὲ τῆς
 Ῥοδίων πόλεως, ὅφ' ἥς ἐδόθη δῶρον· ἐχρήτο δὲ καὶ
 τούτῳ πρὸς τοὺς ἀγῶνας.

3 θώρακα: cf. *Curtius* 4.13.25

[CLMP] 1 περιέθετο CMPL²: υπερέθετο L 2 ὀπλισμόν CMPL²:
 λογισμόν L 3 ὑπένδυμα *Coraes*: ἐπένδυμα *codd.* τούτῳ PL²:
 τούτων LCM 4 διπλοῦν *om. PC* 9 ἦν *del. Schaefer*

60A Timachidas Rhodius, *Tabula de prodigiis* 1 = *ILind.* 2 D.1–59

* Ἐπιφάνειαι.

- Δαρείου τοῦ Περσῶν βασιλέως ἐπὶ καταδουλώσει
 τᾶς Ἑλλάδος ἐκπέμψαντος μεγάλας δυνάμεις,
 ὁ ναυτικὸς αὐτοῦ στόλος ταῦτα ποτεπέλασε
 5 πρᾶται τᾶν νάσων. καταπλαγέντων δὲ τῶν κατὰ
 τὰν χώραν τὰν ἔφοδον τῶν Περσῶν καὶ συμ-
 φυγόντων μὲν ἐς πάντα τὰ ὀχυρώματα, τῶν
 πλείστων δὲ ἐς Λίνδον ἀθροισθέντων, ποθε-
 δρεύσαντες ἐπολιόρκευν αὐτοὺς τοὶ
 10 βάρβαροι, ἔστε οὐ διὰ τὰν σπάνιν τοῦ ὕδα-
 τος τοὶ Λίνδιοι θλιβόμενοι διενοεῦντο
 παραδιδόμειν τοῖς ἐναντίοις τὰν πόλιν.

ried a sword of marvelous temper and lightness, which the king of Citium had given him; it was his practice in battle to rely most on a sword. He wore a mantle more splendid in its construction than the rest of his gear; for it was made by Helicon long before and was a treasure of the Rhodian polity, which had given it as a gift;¹ he used to wear this also at athletic contests.

Plutarch describes preparations for the decisive battle of Gaugamela on 1 October 331, where Alexander routed Darius III and won control of the Persian heartland. In the following year, he dedicated his arms to Athena Lindios along with some inscribed “oxheads” from a sacrifice ordained by a prophecy of the Lindian priest of Athena; see *ILind* 2 C.103–8, with Blinkenberg (1941) 179–80. The ultimate source of Plutarch’s description is probably Callisthenes (cf. *FGrH* 124 F 36–7); and the “Alexander mosaic” from Pompeii, which is based on a contemporary painting, also depicts Alexander in a tunic and breastplate, carrying a sword, and wearing a mantle (unfortunately obscured by his frontal pose), while a magnificent helmet lies at his horse’s feet; see P. Moreno, *Apelles: The Alexander Mosaic* (Milan 2001) 23–4 and pl. 6–7. Although the mosaic may instead depict the earlier battle of Issus (see Bosworth 61–2), the parallels are striking, despite differences in detail; see T. Hölscher, *Griechische Historienbilder* (*Beiträge zur Archäologie* 6: Würzburg 1973) 127–31.

¹ “Rhodian polity” (literally “*polis* of Rhodians”) refers not to the city of Rhodes but to the federal government of the island and its mainland territories. The cloak may have been a token of allegiance presented when ten Rhodian ships joined Alexander’s forces during his siege of Tyre in 332 (Arrian *Anab.* 2.20; see Hamilton 86), or at the Panhellenic celebration there the following summer (see Bosworth 74–5).

60A Timachidas of Rhodes, *Epiphanies of Athena* 1 (*ILind.* 2 D.1–59)

Manifestations

When King Darius of Persia sent out great forces to enslave Greece, his fleet approached this island first.¹ The people in the countryside were terrified at the arrival of the Persians and took refuge in all available fortifications. Most gathered inside Lindos, where the barbarians surrounded them and laid siege, until the Lindians, pressed by a shortage of water, were ready to surrender the city to the enemy. But at that point, the goddess appeared to one

- καθ' ὃν δὴ χρόνον ἅ μὲν θεὸς ἐνὶ τῶν ἀρ-
 χόντων ἐπιστᾶσα καθ' ὕπνον παρεκάλει
 15 θαρσεῖν ὡς αὐτὰ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αἰτήσευ-
 μένα τὸ κατεπεῖγον αὐτοὺς ὕδωρ. ὁ δὲ τὰν
 ὄψιν ἰδὼν ἀνάγγειλε τοῖς πολίταις τὰν πο-
 τίταξιν τᾶς Ἀθάνας, οἱ δὲ ἐξετάξαντες
 20 ὅτι εἰς πέντε ἀμέρας μό[νο]ν ἔχοντι διαρ-
 κεῦν, ἐπὶ τοσαύτας μό[νο]ν αἰτήσαντο
 παρὰ τῶν βαρβάρων τὰς ἀνοχάς, λέγοντες
 ἀπεστάλκειν τὰν Ἀθάναν ποτὶ τὸν αὐτὰς
 πατέρα περὶ βοαθείας, καὶ εἴ κα μὴ παραγέ-
 νηται κατὰ τὸν ὠρισμένον χρόνον, παρα-
 25 δωσεῖν ἔφασαν αὐτοῖς τὰν πόλιν.
 Δᾶτις δὲ ὁ Δαρείου ναύαρχος παραχρηῖμα
 μὲν ἀκούσας ἐγέλασε, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐν τᾷ
 ἐχομέναι ἀμέραι γνώφ[ο]ν μείζονος
 περὶ τὰν ἀκρόπολιν συστάντος καὶ πολ-
 30 λοῦ καταραγέ[ν]τος ὄμβρου κατὰ μέσον
 ο[ὕ]τως παραδόξως τοῖ μὲν πολιορκεύμε-
 νοι δαψιλὲς ἔσχον ὕδωρ, ἅ δὲ Περσικὰ δύνα-
 μεις ἐσπᾶνιζε, καταπλαγεῖς ὁ βάρβα[ρος]
 τὰν τᾶς θεοῦ ἐπιφάνειαν κα[ὶ] ἀφελ[ο]μέ-
 35 νος αὐτοῦ τὸν περὶ τ[ὸ] σ[ώ]μα κόσμον εἰσέ-
 πεμψε ἀνα[θ]έ[μ]ειν τόν τε φαρεὸν καὶ σ[τ]ρε-
 [πτ]ὸν καὶ ψέλια, ποτὶ δὲ τούτοις τιάραν τε
 καὶ ἀκινάκαν, ἔτι δὲ ἀρμάμαξαν, ἃ πρότε-
 ρον μὲν διεσώζετο, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἱερέως
 40 τοῦ Ἀλίου Εὐκλεῦς τοῦ Ἀστυανακτίδα
 ἐμπυρισθέντος τοῦ ναοῦ κατεκαύσθη
 μετὰ τῶν πλείστων ἀναθεμάτων. αὐτὸς
 δ[ὲ] ὁ Δᾶτις ἀνέξενε ἐπὶ τὰς προκειμέ-
 45 [ν]ας πράξεις φιλίαν ποτὶ τοὺς πολιορ-
 [κ]ηθέντας συνθέμενος καὶ ποταποφω-
 [ν]ήσας, ὅτι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τούτους
 θεοὶ φυλάσσουσι. περὶ τούτων ἀποφαί-
 νεται Εὐδημος ἐν τῷ Λινδιακῷ, Ἐργίας
 ἐν τῷ δ' τὰν Ἱστοριᾶν, Πολύζαλος ἐν τῷ δ'
 50 τὰν Ἱστοριᾶν, Ἱερώνυμος ἐν τῷ β'
 τῶν Ἠλιακῶν, Μύρων ἐν τῷ α' τοῦ Ῥόδου

of the archons in a dream urging them to take heart because she was going to ask her father for the water they sorely needed. After seeing his vision, the archon reported Athena's command to the citizens. After calculating that they had water for only five more days, they asked the barbarians for a truce for only that many days, saying that Athena had gone to her father for help; and if she did not return in the specified time, they said they would surrender the city.

Datis, Darius' naval commander, laughed when he heard this. But on the next day a large dark cloud formed over the acropolis and a downpour unexpectedly broke out over the city; and those under siege received abundant water but the Persian forces very little. The barbarian, terrified at this manifestation of the goddess, removed all his gear and sent it into Lindos for dedication: his mantle, a torque, bracelets, and in addition, a tiara, a dagger, and even a covered chariot.² All this survived until the temple caught fire while Eucles son of Astyanactis was priest of Helios, when it was burned up along with most of the dedications.³ Datis himself withdrew to pursue his objectives elsewhere after first making a treaty of friendship with the besieged and declaring that gods protected these people.

These matters are recounted by Eudemus in the *Lindian*,⁴ Ergias in Book 4 of the *Histories*, Polyzelus in Book 4 of the *Histories*, Hieronymus in Book 2 of the *Heliaca*, Myron in Book 1 of the

- ἐγκωμίου, Τιμόκριτος ἐν τᾷ α' τᾷς Χρο-
νικᾷς συντάξις, Ἰέρων ἐν τᾷ α' τᾷν Πε-
ρὶ Ῥόδου. Ξεναγόρας δὲ λέγει ἐν τᾷ δ'
55 τᾷς Χρονικᾷς συντάξις τὰν μὲν ἐπιφά-
νειαν γέγονειν, Μαρδονίου μέντοι ἐξαπο-
σταλέντος ὑπὸ Δάτιος. λέγει δὲ περ[ὶ] τᾷς
ἐπιφανείας καὶ Ἀριστίων ἐν [τᾷ]ι α' [τᾷ]ς
Χρονικᾷς συντάξις.

1-59 *Timachidas* 532 F 1 FGrH 36-8 cf. *Plat. Resp.* 8 553C 48
Eudemus 525 F 3 FGrH, cf. F. Wehrli, *Eudemus* (1969) 78 48 *Ergias*
513 F 3 FGrH 49 *Polyzelus* 521 F 5 FGrH 51 *Myron* 106 F 5
FGrH 52 *Timocritus* 522 FGrH 53 *Hiero* 518 FGrH 54
Xenagoras 240 F 24 FGrH 58 *Aristion* 509 FGrH

5 πρᾶται *Blinkenberg*: πρᾶταν *Inscr.* 28 μείζονος *Blinkenberg*:
μειζωνος *Inscr.* 31 ο[ὕ]τως *Blinkenberg*: ο[.]τος *Inscr.* 36
φαρέον: φᾶρος *susp. Blinkenberg* 49 δ' *prior*: γ' *vel β' susp. Jacoby*
(cf. C 35.90) 50 Ἡλιακῶν *Wilamowitz*: Ἡλιακῶν *Blinkenberg*
54 δὲ λέγει *Blinkenberg*: λελεγει *Inscr.*

Encomium of Rhodes, Timocritus in Book 1 of the *Chronicles*, and Hieron in Book 1 of *On Rhodes*. Xenagoras says in Book 4 of the *Chronicles* that the manifestation occurred after Mardonius was replaced by Datis.⁵ Aristion also tells about the manifestation in Book 1 of the *Chronicles*.

From a large inscribed marble stele found below the acropolis at Lindos and originally situated in the sanctuary of Athena on the acropolis (as stated in the decree, A.10). The stele bears an inscription recording a decree from 99 BC (across the top, A) ordering the compilation and display of two lists — one of votive offerings to Athena Lindia (columns B and C) and another of her “epiphanies” or manifestations of divine power (column D) — and assigning the compilation of these lists to “Timachidas son of Hegesitimus, citizen of Lindos,” a scholar known from other sources; see *RE* 2.6 (1936) 1052–60. Both lists are arranged chronologically, and this is the first and earliest of four “epiphanies” recorded here; for other epiphanies in military contexts, including many from the third century, see W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* v. 3 (1979) 11–46. The sources cited at the end of each entry also appear to be listed mostly in chronological order (discrepancies seem to reflect divergent reports); the sequence here suits the career of the Peripatetic Hieronymus. The title of his work evokes the sacred rites and foundation myths of the island, which revered the sun-god Helios; see E. Matelli in this volume. For context and commentary, see Blinkenberg (1941) and C. Higbie, *The Lindian Chronicle* (2003).

¹ In 490 Darius sent an armada of 600 ships under the command of his nephew Artaphernes and Datis the Mede to punish Athens and Eretria for supporting the Ionian revolt in 494 (Hdt. 6.94). Herodotus reports that the fleet sailed from Cilicia to Samos and stopped at Naxos and Delos before proceeding to Euboea and Marathon (6.95–102); and he reports Datis showing similar respect for the Greek shrines on Delos (6.97 and 118). A stop on Rhodes, which lies on the coast route from Cilicia to Samos, is attested only here. Blinkenberg (1941) 192–8 considers the siege apocryphal but the gifts genuine.

² Most of this gear is distinctly Persian and common in Persian diplomatic gifts (cf. gifts from Artaxerxes c. 359, no. 35 on the stone); see Blinkenberg (1941) 192–4. On the custom of dedicating arms, see Pritchett (1979) 240–95.

³ The sanctuary was damaged by fire in the 340s; see Blinkenberg (1941) 198–200.

⁴ Eudemus, who is cited three other times in the inscription, is probably Aristotle’s Rhodian colleague. The form of his “Lindian” discourse (sc. λόγος) is not specified; rebuilding after fire in the 340s would provide a suitable occasion for a speech, letter, or chronicle.

⁵ Mardonius led a Persian expedition in 492 that restored Persian control of Ionia, then crossed the Hellespont and subdued Thasos, the Thracian coast, and parts of Macedonia before withdrawing after heavy losses (Hdt. 6.43–5).

60B Timachidas Rhodius, *Tabula de donis votivis* 32 = *ILind.* 2 C.65–74

- * 65 [----- στ]ραταγὸς τοῦ Περσᾶν βασιλέως
 [Δαρείου ἐνωτίδι]α καὶ στρεπτόν καὶ τιάραν καὶ ψέ-
 [λια καὶ ἀκινάκαν κα]ὶ ἀναξυρίδας, ὥς φατι Εὐδημος
 [ἐν τῷ Λινδιακῷ, Μ]ύρων ἐν τῷ α' τοῦ 'Ρόδου ἐγκωμίου,
 Τ[ι]μό[κριτος ἐν] τῷ α' τᾶς Χρονικᾶς συντάξις. [Ἰ]ερῶ-
 70 νυμος δὲ ἀποφαίνεται ἐν τῷ α' τῶν 'Ηλιακῶν μετὰ
 τούτων ἀναθέμειν αὐτόν καὶ ἁρμάμαξαν, περὶ ᾧ
 λέγει καὶ Πολύζαλος ἐν τῷ δ' τῶν 'Ιστοριᾶν καὶ
 'Αριστίων ἐν τῷ α' τᾶς Χρονικᾶς συντάξις,
 'Ιέρων ἐν τῷ α' τῶν Περὶ 'Ρόδου.

65–74 *Timachidas* 532 F 1 FGrH, *Eudemus* 525 F 2 FGrH, *Myron* 106 F 4 FGrH, *Timocritus* 522 FGrH, *Polyzelus* 521 F 4 FGrH, *Aristion* 509 FGrH, *Hiero* 518 FGrH 66–7 cf. *Plat. Resp.* 8 553C

65 lac. c. 15 litt.: 'Αρταφέρνης ὁ suppl. *Blinkenberg*: Μαρδόνιος ὁ *Broecker*: Δᾶτις ὁ Δαρείου *Rehm* 66 lac. c. 15 litt.: Δαρείου suppl. *Blinkenberg* ἐνωτίδι]α suppl. *Holleaux*: πορφυρίδ]α *Boissevin* 67 lac. c. 15 litt.: suppl. *Blinkenberg* (cf. **60A.38**) 68 ἐν τῷ Λινδιακῷ suppl. *Blinkenberg* (cf. **60A.48**) 70 α': fortasse β' (cf. **60A.50**) 'Ηλιακῶν *Wilamowitz*: 'Ηλιακῶν *Blinkenberg*

De poetis [Περὶ ποιητῶν]

61A Damascius, *De principiis* 123 = 1.316.13–319.7 Ruelle (CB t. 3 p. 159.10–162.18 Westerink)

- * ἐπεὶ δὲ τούτων καὶ ὅπως οὖν ἐπεμνήσθημεν τῆς περὶ
 τῶν νοητῶν προβολῆς εἵνεκα καὶ διακαθάρσεως τῶν
 ἡμετέρων ἐννοιῶν, φέρε νῦν τὰ μέτρια παριστορήσωμεν
 καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεολόγων τὰς περὶ τοῦ νοητοῦ διακόσμου
 παραδόσεις, εἴ τι καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων δυνάμεθα σέβας ἀνα- 5
 λαβεῖν ἔτι μείζον καὶ ὥς ἐνὶ μέγιστον τῆς ὑπερβαλλού-
 σης ἐκείνης ἐνώσεως.
 ἐν μὲν τοίνυν ταῖς φερομέναις ταύταις 'Ραψωδίαις

60B Timachidas of Rhodes, *Dedications to Athena* 32 (*ILind.* 2 C.60–74)

< ? the> general of King <Darius> of Persia,¹ [dedicated] <earrings>, a torque, a tiara, bracelets, <a dagger>, and trousers, as stated by Eudemus <in the *Lindian*>, Myron in Book 1 of the *Encomium of Rhodes*, and Timocritus in Book 1 of the *Chronicles*. Hieronymus records in Book 1 of the *Heliaca* that along with these he also dedicated a covered chariot,² which is mentioned also by Polyzelus in Book 4 of the *Histories*, Aristion in Book 1 of the *Chronicles*, and Hieron in Book 1 of *On Rhodes*.

From the same stele; this is the 32d of 45 dedications listed in chronological order. The votives and sources (and probably the dedicator; see n. 1) differ slightly from those in **60A**. If there were two dedications, the parallels can be explained as standard Persian practice (see **60A** n. 2); if there was only one, this is the only case of duplication in the entire inscription.

¹ The name of the general is worn away; the likeliest supplement is Artaphernes (cf. Hdt. 6.94) or Mardonius (cf. **60A**.56 and n. 5); the long lacuna makes Datis less likely, despite his role in **60A**.

² **60A**.50 cites “Book 2” of the *Heliaca*.

On Poets [*On Poets*]

61A Damascius, *On First Principles* 123

Since we recalled some of these points¹ for the purpose of revealing the intelligibles and purifying our concepts, come, let us now add a brief report also about the traditions concerning the intelligible realm found in the other theologians, so we may acquire from them too a reverence still greater — and as great as possible — for that transcendent unity.

First, then, in these Orphic *Rhapsodies* currently circulating, the

¹ The ontological principles Damascius has just expounded in his allegorical reading of the Chaldean Oracles, especially the “intelligible triad” comprising intelligible being, life, and intellect.

Ὀρφικαῖς ἡ θεολογία τοιάδε τίς ἐστιν ἢ περὶ τὸν νοητόν,
 ἦν καὶ οἱ φιλόσοφοι διερμνεύουσιν ἀντὶ μὲν τῆς μιᾶς 10
 τῶν ὅλων ἀρχῆς τὸν Χρόνον τιθέντες, ἀντὶ δὲ τοῖν δυεῖν
 Αἰθέρα καὶ Χάος, ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ὄντος ἀπλῶς τὸ φὸν ἀπο-
 λογιζόμενοι, καὶ τριάδα ταύτην πρώτην ποιοῦντες· εἰς
 δὲ τὴν δευτέραν τελεῖν ἦτοι τὸ κυούμενον καὶ τὸ κύον
 φὸν τὸν θεόν, ἢ τὸν ἀργῆτα χιτῶνα, ἢ τὴν νεφέλην, ὅτι ἐκ 15
 τούτων ἐκθρῶσκει ὁ Φάνης (ἄλλοτε γὰρ ἄλλα περὶ τοῦ
 μέσου φιλοσοφοῦσιν), τοῦτο μὲν ὁποῖον ἂν ᾖ ὡς τὸν
 νοῦν, ὡς δὲ πατέρα καὶ δύναμιν ἄλλα τινὰ προσεπινο-
 οῦντες οὐδὲν τῷ Ὀρφεῖ προσήκοντα, τὴν δὲ τρίτην τὸν
 Μῆτιν ὡς νοῦν, τὸν Ἑρικεπαῖον ὡς δύναμιν, τὸν Φάνη- 20
 τα αὐτὸν ὡς πατέρα. μήποτε δὲ καὶ τὴν μέσσην τριάδα
 θετέον κατὰ τὸν τρίμορφον θεὸν ἔτι κυόμενον ἐν τῷ φῶ·
 καὶ γὰρ τὸ μέσον ἀεὶ φαντάζει συναμφοτέρων τῶν
 ἄκρων, ὥσπερ καὶ τοῦτο ἅμα καὶ φὸν καὶ τρίμορφος [ὁ]
 θεός. καὶ ὁρᾷς ὅτι τὸ μὲν φὸν ἐστιν τὸ ἡνωμένον, ὁ δὲ 25
 τρίμορφος καὶ πολύμορφος τῷ ὄντι θεὸς τὸ διακεκρι-
 μένον τοῦ νοητοῦ, τὸ δὲ μέσον κατὰ μὲν τὸ φὸν ἔτι ἡνω-
 μένον, κατὰ δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἤδη διακεκριμένον, τὸ δὲ ὅλον
 εἰπεῖν, διακρινόμενον. τοιαύτη μὲν ἡ συνήθης Ὀρφικὴ
 θεολογία. 30

10–12 cf. *Orphic. F 66a Kern, Princ. 50 (2.24 Westerink)* 12–13 cf.
Orphic. F 70 Kern = Princ. 55 (2.40 Westerink) 14–16 cf. *Orphic.*
F 72–6, 79 Kern 20–1 cf. *Orphic. F 80, 85–7 Kern, Princ. 53 (2.34*
Westerink), Princ. 98 (3.55 Westerink)

[A = *Marcianus 246, s. ix*] 9 τοιάδε Kroll: δέ A: ἥδε Diels 20 ὡς
 νοῦν A in marg. 23 φαντάζεται σὺν ἀμφοτέρω susp. *Westerink* 24
 ὥσπερ: ὥστε susp. *Westerink* ὁ puncto del. A

theology concerning the intelligible goes something like this, as the philosophers interpret it.² 1) They treat Time as the single principle of all entities, and Aether and Chaos as the dyad, and they explain the Egg simply as being; this they make the first triad.³ 2) The second triad, they say, ends in either the gestating Egg that begets the god, or the “shining tunic,” or the cloud, because out of these springs Phanes; for they expound the middle triad differently in different contexts.⁴ This [sc. the Egg], whatever it is like, they treat as intellect; but as father and potency they introduce various other ideas entirely unrelated to Orpheus. 3) For the third triad they treat Metis as intellect, Erikepaïos as potency, and Phanes himself as father.⁵ (Perhaps one should also treat the middle triad as the triform god when it is still gestating in the Egg; after all, the middle term always displays both extremes, just as this too is both an egg and a triform god.⁶ And you see that the Egg is the unified, and the triform and really multiform god is what is differentiated from the intelligible, whereas the middle is still unified, as the Egg, already differentiated as the god, and as a whole still undergoing differentiation.) Such is the standard Orphic theology.

² “The philosophers” refers primarily to Syrianus and Proclus, whose allegorical interpretations of the initial stages of Orphic narratives Damascius here summarizes; see Combès v. 3 229 n. 8, West (1983) 227–31, Brisson (1987).

³ The “single principle” is the One (Combès v. 1 103 n. 4), which for Syrianus and Proclus is the supreme principle, whereas Damascius postulates a still higher “ineffable” principle (cf. line 36). The dyad of Aether and Chaos (literally “Brightness and Chasm”) together with the Egg form the “henadic triad” of the One-all (or Limit), All-one (or Unlimited), and Unified. For parallels to this cosmogonic triad, see M. West, “*Ab Ovo*,” *CQ* 44 (1994) 289–307.

⁴ The “second” or “middle” triad of the “intelligibles” (cf. n. 1 above), which Damascius criticizes his predecessors for handling ineffectively; that may be why he here names only its described in three ways: as the source of the third triad (note present κρυόμενον here and in 23), then as a diaphanous amniotic membrane (see Brisson [1991] 172 n. 22), and finally as moist darkness (cf. “misty Erebus” in the Hieronymus account).

⁵ The three titles or manifestations form a third “intelligible intellective” triad, which Damascius lists in reverse order: Phanes or “Manifest”; Erikepaïos, an obscure and probably alien title (see West [1983] 205); and Metis or “Guile.” Another title of Phanes, found in the Hieronymus account and elsewhere, is Protogonos or “Firstborn”; see West (1983) 103–7.

⁶ In this and the following sentence, Damascius adds his own gloss on the “standard” interpretation of his teachers. The “triform god” is Phanes-Erikepaïos-Metis.

ἡ δὲ κατὰ τὸν Ἱερώνυμον φερομένη καὶ Ἑλλάνικον,
 εἵπερ μὴ καὶ ὁ αὐτός ἐστιν, οὕτως ἔχει· ὕδωρ ἦν, φησίν,
 ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ ὕλη ἐξ ἧς ἐπάγη ἡ γῆ, δύο ταύτας ἀρχὰς
 ὑποτιθέμενος πρώτας, ὕδωρ καὶ γῆν, ταύτην μὲν ὡς φύσ- 35
 ει σκεδαστήν, ἐκεῖνο δὲ ὡς ταύτης κολλητικόν τε καὶ
 συνεκτικόν. τὴν δὲ μίαν πρὸ τῶν δυεῖν ἄρρητον ἀφίη-
 σιν· αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ μηδὲ φάναι περὶ αὐτῆς ἐνδείκνυται
 αὐτῆς τὴν ἀπόρρητον φύσιν. τὴν δὲ τρίτην ἀρχὴν μετὰ
 τὰς δύο γεννηθῆναι μὲν ἐκ τούτων (ὕδατός φημι καὶ
 γῆς), δράκοντα δὲ εἶναι κεφαλὰς ἔχοντα προσπεφυκυίας 40
 ταύρου καὶ λέοντος, ἐν μέσῳ δὲ θεοῦ πρόσωπον, ἔχειν δὲ
 καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὠμων πετερά, ὠνομάσθαι δὲ “Χρόνον ἀγήρ-
 αον” καὶ Ἡρακλῆα τὸν αὐτόν· συνεῖναι δὲ αὐτῷ τὴν
 Ἀνάγκην, φύσιν οὖσαν τὴν αὐτὴν, καὶ Ἀδράστειαν δισ-
 ῶματον διωργυιωμένην ἐν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ, τῶν περάτων 45

31–80 *Orphic. F 54 Kern* = *Orph. 1 B 13a DK* = *Hell. 4 F 87 FG rH*,
cf. Hieron. Aegyp. 787 F 3 FG rH, Hieron. DPhA 3 (2000) H 128; cf.
Orphic. F 55–6 Kern 35 σκεδαστήν: *cf. Plat. Tim. 37A5* 35–6
 κολλητικόν τε καὶ συνεκτικόν: *cf. Plat. Tim. 43A2* 42–3 *cf. Orphic.*
F 66a Kern 43–5 *cf. Orphic. F 162 Kern* 45–6 *cf. Plat. Resp.*
616C

33 ὕλη: ἰλύς *Zoëga (cf. 61B.15)* 34 πρώτας *Kroll*: πρώτος *A* 42–
 3 ἀγήραον *Lobeck*: ἀγήρατον *A* 44–5 δισώματον *Gruppe*:
 ἀσώματον *A*

The theology circulating under the names of Hieronymus and Hellanicus, if indeed this is not the same,⁷ goes like this: 1) There was water, it says, originally and matter out of which the earth solidified;⁸ these two principles it posits first, water and earth, the latter as dispersive in nature and the former for bonding and holding the other together.⁹ But the one principle prior to these two it leaves unexpressed; for this very silence about it indicates its ineffable nature.¹⁰ The third principle after the two was generated out of these (I mean water and earth): it is a serpent that has a bull's head and a lion's head as outgrowths, and a god's face in between, and also wings on its shoulders; it is named "ageless Time" and also Heracles, and it is united with Necessity, which is the same in nature, and Adrasteia,¹¹ double-bodied¹² and stretching across the entire cosmos and touching its limits.¹³ This [sc. the serpent named

⁷ Probably "the same person": Damascius expresses uncertainty about the origin of this account, which he seems to suspect is one writer with two names; alternatively "the same account" found in both writers (if ὁ αὐτός refers to a λόγος implied by θεολογία in lines 9 and 31). Damascius implies that some version of this account was still "circulating" (present φερομένη as in line 8). The identity of this Hellanicus is uncertain; Jacoby, *FGrH* 1 (1923) 458, favors the fifth-century chronicler from Lesbos; for other candidates, see West (1983) 176–8.

⁸ Perhaps by a settling of sediment; cf. "mud" in **61B**. The subject of "says" (and similar verbs throughout this and the next paragraph) may be either the exegetical "theology" or its author(s), as in the preceding paragraph, and probably not any Orphic narrative itself.

⁹ Surprisingly, water is the "binding" agent, earth the "dispersive" factor.

¹⁰ Damascius here alludes to the "ineffable" One.

¹¹ The phrasing is obscure. As translated, Time and Necessity are distinct but have "the same nature," and Time unites with both Necessity and Adrasteia (literally "Ineluctable"); or if καί is epexegetic, Adrasteia is simply an alternative title of Necessity; cf. West (1983) 178. Alternatively, Time unites with Necessity, "which is also Nature and Adrasteia" (though τήν before αὐτήν then seems otiose); see Brisson (1991) 195 n. 41, Combès v. 3 321 n. 1. In either case, the "union" of Time and Necessity may be specifically sexual, or merely temporal.

¹² "Double-bodied" (an emendation for "incorporeal"; cf. n. 19, **61B** n. 4, **61C**.8–10) refers to the composite of winged serpent and three different heads.

¹³ The serpent Time completes the first "henadic" triad. Its peculiar theriomorphic features may symbolize the zodiac, as a measure of Time; see Brisson (1985), who ascribes this to Mithraic influence in the first or second century CE. Its multiple names are also puzzling: Heracles may allude again to the zodiac (Brisson [1991] 199–200) or to the Great Year (West [1983] 190–4); Necessity and Adrasteia, which echo Platonic myth (*Rep.* 10 616C and *Phdr.* 248C), were probably assigned similar celestial significance.

αὐτοῦ ἐφαπτομένην. ταύτην οἶμαι λέγεσθαι τὴν τρίτην ἀρχὴν κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐστῶσαν, πλην ὅτι ἀρσενόθηλυν αὐτὴν ὑπεστήσατο πρὸς ἐνδειξιν τῆς πάντων γεννητικῆς αἰτίας. καὶ ὑπολαμβάνω τὴν ἐν ταῖς Ῥαψωδίαις θεολογίαν, ἀφείσαν τὰς δύο πρώτας ἀρχὰς μετὰ τῆς μιᾶς πρὸ τῶν δυεῖν τῇ σιγῇ παραδοθείσης, ἀπὸ τῆς τρίτης μετὰ τὰς δύο ταύτης ἐνστήσασθαι τὴν ἀρχήν, ὡς πρώτης ῥητόν τι ἐχούσης καὶ σύμμετρον πρὸς ἀνθρώπων ἀκοάς. οὗτος γὰρ ἦν ὁ πολυτίμητος ἐν ἐκείνῃ “Χρόνος ἀγήραος” καὶ Αἰθέρος καὶ Χάους πατήρ.

ἀμέλει καὶ κατὰ ταύτην ὁ Χρόνος οὗτος ὁ δράκων γεννᾶται τριπλὴν γονήν, Αἰθέρα φησὶ νοτερόν καὶ Χάος ἄπειρον καὶ τρίτον ἐπὶ τούτοις Ἑρεβος ὁμιχλῶδες. τὴν δευτέραν ταύτην τριάδα ἀνάλογον τῇ πρώτῃ παραδίδωσι δυναμικὴν οὖσαν ὡς ἐκείνην πατρικὴν. διὸ καὶ τὸ τρίτον αὐτῆς Ἑρεβός ἐστιν ὁμιχλῶδες, καὶ τὸ πατρικόν τε καὶ ἄκρον Αἰθήρ οὐχ ἀπλῶς ἀλλὰ νοτερός· τὸ δὲ μέσον αὐτόθεν Χάος ἄπειρον. ἀλλὰ μὴν ἐν τούτοις, ὡς λέγει, ὁ Χρόνος ὦν ἐγέννησεν, τοῦ Χρόνου ποιούσα γέννημα καὶ αὕτη ἡ παράδοσις, καὶ ἐν τούτοις τικτόμενον ὅτι καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων ἡ τρίτη πρόεισι νοητὴ τριάς. τίς οὖν αὕτη ἐστί; τὸ ὦν, ἡ δυὰς τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ φύσεων, ἄρρενος καὶ θηλείας, καὶ τῶν ἐν μέσῳ παντοίων σπερμάτων τὸ πληθος, καὶ τρίτον ἐπὶ τούτοις θεὸν δισώματον, πτέρυγας ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων ἔχοντα χρυσᾶς, ὃς ἐν μὲν ταῖς λαγόσι προσπεφυκυίας εἶχε ταύρων κεφαλᾶς, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς δράκοντα πελώριον παντοδαπαῖς μορφαῖς θηρίων ἰνδαλλόμενον. τοῦτον μὲν οὖν ὡς νοῦν

57–8 cf. *Orphic. F 66a Kern* 64–5 cf. *Orphic. F 70 Kern* 68 cf. ζῶν τι ἀρρενόθηλυ *ps.-Clem. Hom. 6.5 (PG 2 200C)* et ἀρρενόθηλυν Φανῆς 6.12 (205B) = *Orphic. F 56a Kern*, masculofeminam ... Phane-tam *Ruf. Recog. 10.17 (PG 1 1429A)* = *Orphic. F 56b Kern*, cf. 10.30 (1437A) 69–70 cf. *duplicis formae Ruf. Recog. 10.17 (PG 1 1429A)*

57 φησὶ A: φημὶ *Lobeck* 59–60 παραδιδούς *susp. Westerink* 69–70 δισώματον *Westerink*: ἀσώματον A

Time etc.], I think, expresses the third principle, which stands as being,¹⁴ except this account made it bisexual to indicate the generative cause of all things. And I believe that the theology in the *Rhapsodies*, since it dispensed with the two first principles [sc. water and earth] along with the single one prior to them [sc. the One] on which the tradition is silent, starts from this third principle after the two, since that is the first which is at all expressible and commensurate with human hearing; for this was the “ageless Time” and father of Aether and Chaos which is honored most in that account.¹⁵

Surely, in this account too, 2) this serpent Time generates a triple progeny: “moist Aether,” it says, “limitless Chaos,” and third after these “misty Erebos.”¹⁶ This second triad it treats as analogous to the first: this one is potential as the first is paternal. That is why its third term is “misty” Erebos, its first and paternal term is not simply Aether but “moist,” and its middle term is inherently “limitless” Chaos.¹⁷ 3) Yet “in these,” it says, Time generated an Egg, which this tradition too makes an offspring of Time; and the Egg is born “in these” because also from them there proceeds the third intelligible triad.¹⁸ What is this? The Egg; the pair of natures in it, both male and female and all the many diverse seeds in between; and third after these, a double-bodied god with golden wings on its shoulders, which has bulls’ heads as outgrowths on its flanks, and on top of its head a “huge serpent shimmering” with all kinds of animal shapes.¹⁹ Now this serpent one should treat as intellect in

¹⁴ Or perhaps “substance.”

¹⁵ Damascius interrupts his summary of the Hieronymus account, which he evidently favors, to criticize his predecessors for neglecting the twofold source of Time (viz. water and earth, or their divine counterparts).

¹⁶ Returning to Hieronymus, Damascius specifies its analogues to the second “intelligible” triad: Aether and Chaos, as in the previous account (cf. n. 3 above), but now also Erebos or “Darkness” (cf. n. 4 above).

¹⁷ Damascius, after claiming that these epithets indicate parallels between the first and second triads, fails to make their significance explicit: Aether is presumably “moist” like water and Chaos “limitless” like “unlimited” earth; but why Erebos should be “misty” is not clear.

¹⁸ A reference to “procession” or emanation, the principle of ontological dependence here allegorized temporally as a process of generation and procreation.

¹⁹ “Double-bodied” is again an emendation for “incorporeal”; cf. n. 12 and Testimonia at 61A.69–70. On this second serpentine god and its multiple titles, see West (1983) 202–7.

τῆς τριάδος ὑποληπτέον, τὰ δὲ μέσα γένη τά τε πολλὰ
καὶ τὰ δύο τὴν δύναμιν, αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ φὸν ἀρχὴν πατρικὴν 75
τῆς τρίτης τριάδος. ταύτης δὲ τῆς τρίτης τριάδος τὸν
τρίτον θεόν καὶ ἥδε ἡ θεολογία Πρωτόγονον ἀνυμνεῖ,
καὶ Δία καλεῖ πάντων διατάκτορα καὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου,
διὸ καὶ Πᾶνα καλεῖσθαι. τοσαῦτα καὶ αὕτη περὶ τῶν 80
νοητῶν ἀρχῶν ἡ γενεαλογία παρίστησιν.

78–9 *Athenag. Leg.* 20.3 = *Orphic. F* 58 Kern 78 διατάκτορα: cf.
Plat. Tim. 42E5 78–9 Πᾶνα: cf. *Plat. Crat.* 408C

78 *post* κόσμου *coni.* κεραστήν *Maas* (cf. *Orphic. F* 297 Kern)

this triad, the intermediate kinds (both the many and the pair) as potency, and the Egg itself as a paternal principle for the third triad. This theology as well proclaims the third god in this third triad “Protogonos” and calls it “Zeus regulator of all things” and of the whole cosmos, which is why it is also called “Pan.”²⁰ This is how much this genealogy establishes about the intelligible principles.

Damascius concludes his treatise on ultimate principles (*De Princ.* 1–42 on the Ineffable and the One, 43–89 on the henadic triad, 90–126 on the intelligible triad) by citing parallels in various sacred texts, mainly the *Chaldean Oracles* (111–22), then Orphic (123) and other early theogonies (124–5), both Greek (Homer, Hesiod, Acusilaus, Epimenides, Pherecydes) and foreign (Babylonian, Persian, Sidonian, Phoenician, Egyptian). His avowed aim is to show that his Platonist “theology” is in harmony with the oldest traditions of inspired religion (see 111; cf. Plat. *Tim.* 40D–E), which he interprets allegorically so that genealogical succession symbolizes ontological dependence: primordial deities represent ultimate principles, and their descendants represent a “procession” down the ontological hierarchy. Here he summarizes two divergent interpretations of Orphic theogony, first one developed by his Platonist predecessors, then an account he ascribes to Hieronymus and Hellanicus; he then refers briefly to a third account by Eudemus of Rhodes, who is his source for most of the other theogonies he discusses. For Damascius and his treatise, see Combès v. 1 ix–lxiv; on this passage, see West (1983) 176–231, L. Brisson, “Damascius et l’Orphisme” in *Orphisme et Orphée: en l’honneur de J. Rudhardt = Recherches et Rencontres* 3, ed. P. Borgeaud (1991) 157–209, and G. Betegh, “On Eudemus Fr. 150 Wehrli,” in *Eudemus* (2002) 337–57; cf. S. Rappe, *Reading Neoplatonism* (2000) 143–66 on the Neoplatonic background, 197–227 on Damascius’ ontology. For a summary of the Orphic narratives, see West (1983) 70–5, L. Brisson, “Proclus et l’Orphisme” in *Proclus: Lecteur et interprète des Anciens*, ed. J. Pépin and H. D. Saffrey (1987) 43–104, esp. 54–69.

The question of attribution, already problematic for Damascius, remains controversial. C. A. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* (1829) 340 tentatively identified this Hieronymus with the Rhodian and suggested his work *On Poets*; West (1983) 176–82 favors a late Hellenistic antiquarian labeled “the Egyptian” (787 *FGrH*); L. Brisson, “La Figure de Chronos dans la Théogonie Orphique et ses Antécédents Iranien,” in *Mythes et Représentations du Temps*, ed. D. Tiffeneau (1985) 37–55, argues for an early Imperial source. Equally problematic is the basis for Hieronymus’ account: its peculiarities may reflect either a distinct version of Orphic narratives (cf. West 225: a “free re-composition” by a Stoicizing poet), or simply a distinct interpretation of relatively standard texts.

²⁰ Protogonos (“Firstborn”) is a standard title of Phanes; the assimilation with Zeus (*Dia*) and Pan (“all”) as “regulator of all” (*panton diaktora*) is apparently distinctive.

61B Athenagoras, *Legatio de Christianis* 18.3–4 (p. 56.15–57.30 Marcovich)

- * 3 ἐκεῖνο τοίνυν σκέψασθέ μοι πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων. οὐκ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ὥς φασιν, ἦσαν οἱ θεοί, ἀλλ' οὕτως γέγονεν αὐτῶν ἕκαστος ὡς γινόμεθα ἡμεῖς· καὶ τοῦτο πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς ἑυμφωνεῖται, Ὅμηρου μὲν [γὰρ] λέγοντος,
- 5
- Ὡκεανόν τε, θεῶν γένεσιν, καὶ μητέρα Τηθύν,
 Ὀρφέως δέ, ὃς καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν πρῶτος ἐξηῦρεν
 καὶ τὰς γενέσεις διεξῆλθεν καὶ ὅσα ἐκάστοις πέπρακται
 εἶπεν, καὶ πεπίστευται [βασιλείαν ἐξετάζειν ὡς παρ'
 ὑμῖν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ πάντα κεχείρωται ἄνωθεν] παρ' αὐ-
 τοῖς ἀληθέστερον θεολογεῖν, ᾧ καὶ Ὅμηρος τὰ πολλὰ 10
 καὶ περὶ θεῶν μάλιστα ἔπεται, καὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν πρώτην
 γένεσιν αὐτῶν ἐξ ὕδατος συνιστάντος,
 Ὡκεανός, ὅσπερ γένεσις πάντεσσι τέτυκται.
- 4 ἦν γὰρ ὕδωρ ἀρχὴ κατ' αὐτὸν τοῖς ὅλοις, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ
 ὕδατος ἰλὺς κατέστη, ἐκ δὲ ἐκατέρων ἐγεννήθη ζῶον 15
 δράκων προσπεφυκυῖαν ἔχων κεφαλὴν λέοντος, διὰ
 μέσου δὲ αὐτῶν θεοῦ πρόσωπον, ὄνομα Ἡρακλῆς καὶ
 Χρόνος. οὗτος ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἐγέννησεν ὑπερμέγεθες ῥόν, ὃ
 συμπληρούμενον ὑπὸ βίας τοῦ γεγεννηκότος ἐκ παρα-
 τριβῆς εἰς δύο ἐρράγη. τὸ μὲν οὖν κατὰ κορυφὴν αὐτοῦ 20
 Οὐρανὸς εἶναι ἐτελέσθη, τὸ δὲ κάτω ἐνεχθὲν Γῆ· προ-
 ἦλθε δὲ καὶ θεὸς τις δισώματος.

1–22 *Orphic. F 57 Kern* = *Orph. 1 B 13b DK*, cf. *Orphic. F 55–6 Kern*
5 Il. 14.201 = 302, cf. *Plat. Crat. 402B*, *Arist. Meta. 983b30*, *Damasc. Princ. 124* = *Orphic. F 28 Kern* = *Eudemus F 150 Wehrli*, *Philod. Piet. (PHerc 247) col. 6a.6–13* 6 cf. *Leg. 17.1* = *Hdt. 2.53.2* 13 *Il. 14.246* 18–22 cf. *ps.-Clem. Hom. 6.12 (PG 2 205B)* 20 ἐρράγη: cf. *Orphic. F 72 Kern* 20–2 cf. *ps.-Clem. Hom. 6.6 (PG 2 201A)*

[A = *Parisinus* 451, a. 913/4] 4 ἑυμφωνεῖται *Schwartz*: ἑυμφωνεῖ
 A γὰρ *del. Schwartz* 8–9 βασιλείαν ... ἄνωθεν (*ex 18.2*) *del. edd.*
 16 *post* λέοντος *add.* καὶ ἄλλην ταύρου *Lobeck*, cf. **61A.41**: *codd. defendit Norden, Hermes 27 (1892) 614 n. 2*, cf. **61C.4–6** 21 κάτω
 ἐνεχθὲν *Schwartz*: κάτω κατενεχθὲν A: κατενεχθὲν *Maran* 22 τις
 δισώματος *Lobeck*: γῆ διὰ σώματος A: τρίτος [*i.e. γ'*] ἦδη ἀσώματος
Gomperz: πτηνός τις δισώματος *Zeller*: Μῆτις ἀσώματος *Kern*: Γῆ δὲ
 ἀσώματος *Beth*

61B Athenagoras, *Legation concerning Christians* 18.3–4

3 So I ask you to consider this first of all.¹ In the beginning, they say, there were no gods, but each of them has been generated the way we are. And on this they all agree: Homer says, “Ocean, genesis of gods, and mother Tethys”; and Orpheus, who first discovered their names, recounted their generation, told all that each accomplished, and is believed by them to give a truer account of the gods — Homer as well follows him on most points and especially concerning the gods — even Orpheus makes their first generation out of water: “Ocean, who is fashioned origin for all.”² For water was according to him a principle for all entities, and from the water mud settled out, and out of these two was generated a living creature, a serpent with a lion’s head grown onto it and the face of a god in between them;³ its name is Heracles and Time. This Heracles generated an enormous egg, which as it filled up was broken into two by its generator’s violent rubbing. Now the part about its head finally became Sky, the part carried down became Earth, and a double-bodied god⁴ came forth.

Athenagoras, addressing Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus as joint emperors in 177/8 CE, adopts the guise of an envoy (hence the title, also translated as “Plea”) to defend Christians against charges of “atheism” and ritual impiety. After sketching the monotheistic basis of Christian belief and practice (4–17), he presents a critique of Greek literary traditions (18–22), starting here with the belief that gods are generated. Athenagoras cites no source for his summary of Orphic theogony, which continues into further generations in 18.5 and 20 (cf. 32.1). But close parallels with **61A** suggest a common origin, and all of his testimony has been ascribed to the same source, which Damascius names “Hieronymus or Hellanicus”; see West (1983) 179–81, L. Brisson, “Orphée et l’Orphisme à l’époque impériale,” *ANRW* II 36.4 (1990) 2867–2931, esp. 2897–2914. For the likely sources of Athenagoras’ report here, see N. Zeegers-Vander Vorst, *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes Chrétiens du IIe siècle* (1972) 69–79, 144–60, 305–8.

¹ “You” = Marcus Aurelius and Commodus.

² Athenagoras attributes to Orpheus a verse preserved as *Iliad* 14.246. Both this and the previous verse (*Iliad* 14.201 = 302, all from Hera’s conversations with other gods) figure prominently in ancient accounts of early cosmogonies, much of which goes back to Eudemus of Rhodes; see. G. Betegh in *Eudemus* (2002) 349–51. Damascius even cites another verse from the same episode (14.261) against Eudemus as evidence for Night’s priority (F 150 Wehrli = Damasc. *Princ.* 124).

³ Athenagoras, who omits the bull’s head mentioned in **61A**.41, apparently

61C Basilius Minimus, *Commentarius in Gregorii Nazianzeni Orationes ad Or.* 31.16 (*Hermes* t. 27 p. 614–15 Norden)

* τοὺς δὲ Φάνητας πλὴν ὀλίγων οἶμαι πολλοὺς ἀγνοεῖν
 ὅτι εἷς μὲν οὗτος, καὶ πληθυντικῶς λέλεκται. ὑπὸ δέ τι-
 νων ἐμυθολογήθη θεολογούντων δῆθεν ὡς ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ
 ἰλύος ἀναδοθέντος δράκοντος προσπεφυκυῖαν ἔχοντος
 λέοντος κεφαλὴν, διὰ μέσου δὲ αὐτῶν θεοῦ πρόσωπον, 5
 ὃν Ἑρακλῆν φασι, καὶ τούτων ὦν γεννηθῆναι, ὅπερ ἡ
 τοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐκ παρατριβῆς διελοῦσα δύναμις· Φά-
 νης ἡμῖν οὗτος θεὸς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐφάνη, ὃς τὸ μὲν τοῦ κελύ-
 φους ὡς Γῆν καταλιπών, τὸ δὲ ὑπὲρ κεφαλὴν αἰωρήσας
 τὸν Οὐρανὸν ἀπετέλεσεν. 10

4 ἰλύος: cf. **61B.15** 5 αὐτῶν: “sc. τῶν τοῦ δράκοντος καὶ λέοντος
 κεφαλῶν” Norden p. 614 n. 2 7 cf. ps.-Clem. Hom. 6.6 (PG 2 201A5–
 6): ὑποθερμανθέν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔσωθεν ζώου ρήγνυται 8–10 cf. ps.-
 Clem. Hom. 6.6 (PG 2 201A11–14)

Scholia in Greg. Naz. Orationes inedita excerpit Norden, Hermes 27
(1892) 606–42; hoc in Or. 31 Περὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος *scholium e*
commentario sumptum Basilii Minimi (Caesareae Cappadociae
archiepiscopi s. x) ad verbum Φάνητας (31.16) spectat. De codic-
ibus, vid. R. Cantarella, Byzantinische Zeitschrift 25 (1925) 292–309.
[MO: M = Monacensis 34, a. 1551; O = Oxoniensis M. Magdalenae
5, s. xi] 6 φασι Norden: φησι MO 7 γεννηθέντος O:
γεγεννηκότος M (cf. 61B.19) post dEnamiw lac. suspicio 9
καταλιπών O: καταλυπών M κεφαλῇ O: κεφαλῆς M

IV. DUBIA

62 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 5.40 206D–E (BT t. 1 p. 457.8–20 Kaibel)

περὶ δὲ τῆς ὑπὸ Ἰέρωνος τοῦ Συρακοσίου κατασκευ-
 ασθείσης νεώς, ἥς καὶ Ἀρχιμήδης ἦν ὁ γεωμέτρης ἐπόπ-

imagines the god's face placed between a lion's and a serpent's heads; cf. **61C** n. 1.

⁴ The text is corrupt here; "double-bodied" is an almost certain emendation for "incorporeal" (cf. **61A** n. 19).

61C Basil Elachistos, *Commentary on the Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus* on 31.16 (p. 614–15 Norden)

These "Phanes": I think many people are unaware that this is a single god even though it is described in many ways. There was a tale told by some theologizers that out of water and mud there arose a serpent with a lion's head grown onto it and the face of a god in between them;¹ this they say is Heracles; and out of these was generated an egg, which its own potency after it was generated divided by rubbing;² out of it there appeared Phanes this god, who by leaving part of the shell below as Earth and raising the other part overhead created the Sky.

Basil, a tenth-century Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (*ODB* 1.263), explains a passing reference by Gregory to the primal gods Ocean, Tethys, and Phanes in early Greek theogonies. On Basil's scholia, see R. Cantarella, "Basilio Minimo I: Scolii inediti con introduzione e note," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 25 (1925) 292–309.

¹ As in Athenagoras, "them" apparently refers to the serpent's and lion's heads; cf. **61B** n. 3.

² There are two textual problems here: one ms. (eleventh century) has "the generated" (sc. the egg) where the other (sixteenth century) has "the generator" (as in **61B**.19); and "divided" translates a participle in a clause which lacks a finite verb due to either corruption (perhaps a lacuna) or anacolouthon.

IV. DOUBTFUL

62 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 5.40 206E

"I think it wrong to omit the ship built by Hieron of Syracuse, which Archimedes the geometer also supervised, since a certain

της, οὐκ ἄξιον εἶναι κρίνω σιωπῆσαι, σύγγραμμα ἐκδόν-
 τος Μοσχίωνός τινος, ᾧ οὐ παρέργως ἐνέτυχον ὑπογυῖως.
 49W γράφει οὖν ὁ Μοσχίων οὕτως· “Διοκλείδης μὲν ὁ Ἀβδη- 5
 E ρίτης θαυμάζεται ἐπὶ τῇ πρὸς τὴν Ῥοδίων πόλιν ὑπὸ Δη-
 μητρίου προσαχθείση τοῖς τείχεσιν ἐλεπόλει, Τίμαιος δ’
 ἐπὶ τῇ πυρᾷ τῇ κατασκευασθείση Διονυσίῳ τῷ Σικελίας
 τυράννῳ, καὶ Ἰερώνυμος ἐπὶ τῇ κατασκευῇ τῆς ἀρμα-
 μάξης, ἣ συνέβαινε κατακομισθῆναι τὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου 10
 σῶμα, Πολύκλειτος δ’ ἐπὶ τῷ λυχνίῳ τῷ κατασκευασ-
 θέντι τῷ Πέρσῃ.”

1–12 *Moschion* 575 F 1 FGrH 5 *Diocleides* RE 5 (1905) 791 no. 3
 7 *Timaeus* 566 F 112 FGrH 9 *Hieronymus Card.* 154 F 2 FGrH,
 cf. *Hornblower* 239 9–11 cf. *Diod. Sic.* 18.26–8 11 *Polyclitus*
 128 F 4 FGrH

[*A cum Epitome CE*] 4 ὑπογυῖως *Kaibel*: ὑπογύως A 5 οὖν
Musurus: γοῦν A 5–12 “*haec omnia audacissime truncata*” *Kaibel*
 6 θαυμάζεται A: θαυμαζέτω *Ritschl* πόλιν: πολιόρχησιν *coni.*
Kaibel

63 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 5.58 217C–E (BT t. 1 p. 48.8–482.3 *Kaibel*)

- * ὅτι δὲ πολλὰ ὁ Πλάτων παρὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἀμαρτάνει
 δῆλόν ἐστιν ἐκ πολλῶν. κατὰ γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα ποιητὴν
 ὅτι κεν ἐπ’ ἀκαιρίμαν γλῶτταν ἔλθῃ,
 D τοῦτο μὴ διακρίνας γράφει. οὐ γὰρ ἀγράφως τι ἔλεγεν,
 ἀλλὰ πάνυ ἐσκεμμένως, ὥς ἐν τῷ Γοργίᾳ γράφων φησίν, 5
 “ἄθλιος ἄρα οὗτος ὁ Ἀρχέλαός ἐστι κατὰ τὸν σὸν λόγον.
 —εἵπερ γε, ὦ φίλε, ἄδικος.” εἶτα ῥητῶς εἰπὼν ὥς κατέχ-
 οντος τὴν Μακεδόνων ἀρχὴν Ἀρχελαίου προβάς γράφει
 τάδε, “καὶ Περικλέα τοῦτον (τὸν) νεωστὶ τετελευτη-
 κότα.” [εἰδέναι] εἰ δὲ ᾧ νεωστὶ τετελεύτηκε Περικλῆς, 10

Moschion published a book which I recently read very closely.¹ Moschion writes as follows: ‘Diocleides of Abdera is admired for
E [sc. his account of]² the siege-machine Demetrius used against the walls of Rhodes, Timaeus for the funeral pyre constructed for Dionysius the tyrant of Sicily, Hieronymus for the carriage built to bring Alexander’s body back, and Polycleitus for the lampstand devised for the Persian [sc. King].’³

The beginning of a long excerpt describing a fantastically large ship (206D–209E); Moschion cites four precedents (all concerning fourth-century events) for his detailed description of a man-made marvel. Although Hieronymus of Rhodes discussed Alexander the Great (cf. **30, 59A–C**), this Hieronymus is most likely the historian from Cardia, whose *Histories of the Successors* recounted the journey of Alexander’s corpse from Babylon to Alexandria in 321 (cf. Diod. Sic. 18.26–28); see Hornblower 40–6, 239.

¹ Moschion is otherwise unknown: *RE* 16 (1933) 348 no. 5. His report (209B) that Hieron II (c. 306–215) sent this ship to a Ptolemy (probably in 230s or 220s) provides a *terminus post quem*; but D. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (1981) 26–7, suspects a fiction of the first century CE or later.

² Or emended lightly, “let [each author] amaze” readers; the verb evokes literary collections of “marvels” (θαύματα).

³ Diocleides is otherwise unknown; for the massive machine used by Demetrius I “Beseiger” in his long but failed siege of Rhodes (305–4), see Diod. Sic. 20.91. The Sicilian Timaeus (c. 350–260) covered the funeral of Dionysius I (c. 430–367) in his history of Sicily. The Thessalian Polycleitus (late fourth century) discussed the royal Persian treasures (probably in reference to the king defeated by Alexander, Darius III); see L. Pearson, *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great* (1969) 70–7.

63 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 5.58 217C–E

“That Plato makes many mistakes in dates is clear from many cases. For like the poet who said ‘whatever came to his untimely
D tongue,’ so he writes without discrimination. For he would speak not ex tempore but only after close investigation, as he does when he writes in the *Gorgias*: ‘So this Archelaus is miserable, on your argument. —If, my friend, he is unjust.’¹ Then, after telling how Archelaus acquired his authority over the Macedonians, he proceeds to write the following: ‘and this Pericles who died very recently.’² If Pericles is ‘very recently’ dead, Archelaus is not yet in

Ἀρχέλαος οὐπω κύριός ἐστι τῆς ἀρχῆς· εἰ δ' οὗτος
 βασιλεύει, πρὸ πολλοῦ πάνυ χρόνου ἀπέθανε Περικλῆς.
 Περδίκκας τοίνυν πρὸ Ἀρχελάου βασιλεύει, ὥς μὲν ὁ
 Ἀκάνθιος φησιν Νικομήδης, ἔτη μὰ', Θεόπομπος δὲ λέ',
 Εἰ Ἀναξιμένης μ', Ἱερώνυμος κη', Μαρσύας δὲ καὶ Φιλό- 15
 χορος κγ'. τούτων οὖν διαφόρως ἱστορουμένων λάβωμεν
 τὸν ἐλάχιστον ἀριθμὸν τὰ κγ' ἔτη. Περικλῆς δ' ἀποθνή-
 σκει κατὰ τὸ τρίτον ἔτος τοῦ Πελοποννησιακοῦ πολέμου
 (ἐπὶ) ἄρχοντος Ἐπαμείνωνος, ἐφ' οὗ τελευτᾷ (<...>) Περ-
 δίκκας καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν Ἀρχέλαος διαδέχεται. πῶς 20
 οὖν “νεωστὶ” κατὰ Πλάτωνα τελευτᾷ Περικλῆς;

1–21 *Herodicus Crat. p. 22.4–19 Düring* 3 *Adesp. F 1020 PMG* 6–
 7 *Plat. Gorg. 471A* 9–10 *Plat. Gorg. 503C* 13–16 *Nicomedes 772*
F 2 FGrH, Theopompus 115 F 279 FGrH, Anaximenes 72 F 27 FGrH,
Hieronymus Card. 154 F 1 FGrH (cf. Hornblower 238–9), Marsyas
135–6 F 15 FGrH, Philochorus 328 F 126 FGrH 17–19 *cf. Thuc.*
2.65.6

4 ἀγράφως : ἀκαίρως *Casaubon* 5 ἀλλὰ : ἀλλ' οὐ *coni. Gulick* 8
 προβάς : ὑποβάς *coni. Cobet* 9 τὸν *add. Kaibel e Platone* 10
 εἰδέναι *del. Musurus* 19 ἐπὶ *add. Schweighaüser lac. indic.*
Casaubon

V. REIECTA

- 64** Strabo, *Geographica* 8.6.21 (de Corintho) = Hieronymus Card. 154 F 16 FGrH (cf. Hornblower p. 251)
- 65** Strabo, *Geographica* 9.5.22 (de Thessalia) = Hieronymus Card. 154 F 17 FGrH (cf. Hornblower p. 251)
- 66** Strabo, *Geographica* 10.4.3 (de Creta) = Hieronymus Card. 154 F 18 FGrH (cf. Hornblower p. 251)

control; but if Archelaus is king, Pericles died very long before.³ Perdiccas, in fact, was king before Archelaus: for 41 years according to Nicomedes of Acanthus, for 35 according to Theopompus, E for 40 according to Anaximenes, for 28 according to Hieronymus, or for 23 according to Marsyas and Philochorus.⁴ Since these reports differ, let's take the smallest number, 23 years. Pericles dies in the third year of the Peloponnesian war in the archonship of Epameinon,⁵ when <...> dies, but Perdiccas <...> and Archelaus succeeds to the throne. So how does Pericles die, according to Plato, 'recently'?"

From a critique of Plato's anachronisms derived from Herodicus of Babylon, a Pergamene scholar (hence called "the Crateteian") of the second century BCE. This Hieronymus, who is cited not for any comment on Plato's dialogues but for the dates of Perdiccas, is most likely the historian from Cardia, whose *History of the Successors* discussed dates of other Macedonian leaders (cf. F 4, 7, 8, 10); see Hornblower 238–9.

¹ The first speaker is the rhetorician Polus, the second Socrates.

² The speaker is Callicles.

³ Archelaus succeeded Perdiccas II as King of Macedon c. 413, allegedly by nefarious means (Plato, *Gorg.* 471), and ruled until his death in 399. Perdiccas II gained the throne from Alexander I c. 450.

⁴ All historians, all fourth-century except Hieronymus and Philochorus (c. 340–260): Theopompus of Chios in his *History of Philip*; Anaximenes of Lampsacus perhaps also in his *History of Philip*; and Nicomedes of Acanthus and Marsyas of Pella (brother of Antigonos I) in their histories of Macedonia.

⁵ Eponymous archon of Athens in 429/8.

V. REJECTED

- 64 Strabo, *Geography* 8.6.21 (on Corinth)
- 65 Strabo, *Geography* 9.5.22 (on Thessaly)
- 66 Strabo, *Geography* 10.4.3 (on Crete)

These topographic and ethnographic reports clearly come from Hieronymus of Cardia (F 16–18); see Hornblower 251.

246 **Lyc0 of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes**

67 Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *De compositione verborum* 4
(orationis ineptae reprehensio) = Hieronymus Card. 154 T 12
FGrH (cf. Hornblower p. 71–2)

- 67** Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *On composition* 4 (criticism of style)

This criticism of several Hellenistic historians patently refers to Hieronymus of Cardia (T 12); see Hornblower 71–2.

CONCORDANCE

- 1 Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, v. 10: *Hieronimos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler* (Basel 1959, 1969)

Wehrli	White	Wehrli	White
1	1A	19	31
2	3A	20	32
3	6	21	27
4	4	22	25
5a	57A	23	26
5b	57B	24	54
6	5	25	9
7	7	26	40
8a	18A	27	29
8b	20A	28	28
8c	11	29	45
8d	14	30	52
9a	18C	31	43A
9b	16B	32	42A
9c	13A	33	41
9d	20B	34	35
9e	16D	35	34
9f	16A	36	33
10a	18B	37	36A
10b	19	38	30
10c	16C	39	47
10d	17	40	48
10e	22	41	49
11	23	42	50
12	15	43	53C
13	12	44	53B
14	21	45	53A
15a	46A	46	51
15b	46B	47	56
16	44A	48	59A
17	44B	49	62
18	24	50	37B

51	37A	52b	38B
52a	38A	53	10
White	Wehrli	White	Wehrli
1A	1	25	22
1B		26	23
2		27	21
3A	2	28	28
3B		29	27
4	4	30	38
5	6	31	19
6	3	32	20
7	7	33	36
8A		34	35
8B		35	34
9	25	36A	37
10	53	36B	
11	8c	36C	
12	13	37A	51
13A	9c	37B	50
13B		38A	52a
14	8d	38B	52b
15	12	39	
16A	9f	40	26
16B	9b	41	33
16C	10c	42A	32
16D	9e	42B	
17	10d	42C	
18A	8a	43A	31
18B	10a	43B	
18C	9a	43C	
19	10b	44A	16
20A	8b	44B	17
20B	9d	45	29
21	14	46A	15a
22	10e	46B	15b
23	11	47	39
24	18	48	40

White	Wehrli	White	Wehrli
49	41	59B	
50	42	59C	
51	46	60A	
52	30	60B	
53A	45	61A	
53B	44	61B	
53C	43	61C	
54	24	62	49
55		63	
56	47	64	
57A	5a	65	
57B	5b	66	
58		67	
59A	48		

- 2 E. Hiller, “Hieronymi Rhodii Peripatetici Fragmenta,” *Satyra Philologa H. Sauppio oblata* (Berlin 1879) 85–118.

Hiller	White	Hiller	White
1	54	11.9	11
2	29	11.10	16D
3	28	11.11	14
4	42A	11.12	13A
5	41	11.13	20B
6	33	11.14	16A
7	34	11.15	17
8	47	11.16	23
9	49	11.17	12
10	30	11.18	21
11.1	18A	11.19	15
11.2	18B	12	22
11.3	18C	13	27
11.4	19	14	25
11.5	16B	15	26
11.6	16B	16	31
11.7	20A	17	35
11.8	16C	18	32

Hiller	White	Hiller	White
19	10	26.3	53A
20	45	27	40
21	48	28	43A
22	50	29	38A, 38B
23	51	30	37A
24	52	31	36A
25	52	32	59A
26.1	53C	33	44B
26.2	53B	34	44A
		35	46A

White	Hiller	White	Hiller
1A	p. 85	18A	11.1
1B		18B	11.2
2		18C	11.3
3A	p. 86	19	11.4
3B		20A	11.7
4	p. 85-6	20B	11.13
5	p. 86	21	11.18
6	p. 86	22	12
7	p. 86	23	11.16
8A	p. 87-8	24	p. 87
8B		25	14
9	p. 88	26	15
10	19	27	13
11	11.9	28	3
12	11.17	29	2
13A	11.12	30	10
13B		31	16
14	11.11	32	18
15	11.19	33	6
16A	11.14	34	7
16B	11.5-6	35	17
16C	11.8	36A	31
16D	11.10	36B	
17	11.15	36C	

White	Hiller	White	Hiller
37A	30	53A	26.3
37B	30 n.	53B	26.2
38A	29	53C	26.1
38B	29	54	1
39		55	
40	27	56	
41	5	57A	
42A	4	57B	
42B	4 n.	58	
42C	4 n.	59A	32
43A	28	59B	32 n.
43B	28 n.	59C	32 n.
43C	28 n.	60A	
44A	34	60B	
44B	33	61A	[p. 118]
45	20	61B	
46A	35	61C	
46B	35 n.	62	[p. 117]
47	8	63	[p. 117]
48	21	64	[p. 118]
49	9	65	[p. 118]
50	22	66	[p. 118]
51	23	67	
52	24, 25		

INDEX OF SOURCES

This Index lists all texts printed in this collection and all other texts in which Hieronymus is named; the latter appear in the upper apparatus (app.) of the texts indicated. Square brackets indicate Doubtful or Rejected texts.

APOSTOLIUS, MICHAEL (s. 15 CE) 9.79 (CPG 2.479)	8A no. 3c, 42A app.	2.138 = <i>Lucullus</i> 138 (BT 97.24–98.5)	13B
ARNOBIUS SICCENSIS (fl. 300 CE) <i>Adversus nationes</i>		<i>De divinatione</i> 1.54 (BT 34.7–16 Giomini)	43B
4.25 (231.20–231.3 Marchesi)	44B	<i>De finibus</i> 2.8–9 (OCT 40.19–41.6 Reynolds)	1B no. 6, 18A
ATHENAEUS NAUCRATITES (s. 2–3 CE) <i>Deipnosophistae</i>		2.15–16 (OCT 44.24–45.9)	18B
2.30 48B (BT 1.112.7–13 Kaibel)	59A	2.19–20 (OCT 47.1–18)	18C
5.40 206D–E (BT 1.457.8–20)	[62]	2.32 (OCT 54.22–55.3)	19
5.58 217D–E (BT 1.481.12–482.2)	[63]	2.35 (OCT 56.8–21)	16B
10.24 424E–F (BT 2.423.15–424.1)	1B no. 2, 3B no. 1, 28	2.41 (OCT 58.11–27)	20A
10.45 434F–35A (BT 2.445.23–446.8)	30	4.49–50 (OCT 155.19–156.2)	16C
11.101 499E–500B (BT 3.102.11–20, 103.11–13)	1B no. 3, 29	5.13–14 (OCT 177.20–178.13)	3B no. 4, 8B no. 1–2, 11
13.2 555E–56B (BT 3.225.25–226.13)	1B no. 4, 53B	5.20 (OCT 180.28–181.4)	16D
13.5 557E (BT 3.229.22–7)	33	5.72–3 (OCT 209.28–210.12)	14
13.78 602A–D (BT 3.327.16–329.2)	3B no. 2, 35	<i>Orator</i> 189–90 (BT 65.2–20 Westman)	3B no. 5, 8B no. 2, 37A
13.81–2 603E, 604D–F (BT 3.331.15–17, 333.9–34.2)	1B no. 5, 34	<i>Tusculanae disputationes</i> 2.15 (BT 287.10–19 Pohlenz)	1B no. 7, 20B
14.37 635E–F (BT 3.403.1–16)	41	5.84–5 (BT 442.22–443.11)	16A
ATHENAGORAS (s. 2 CE) <i>Legatio pro Christianis</i>		5.85–8 (BT 443.12–444.16)	17
18.3–4 (56.15–57.30 Marcovich)	61B	5.118–19 (BT 457.13–458.5)	22
BASILIIUS MINIMUS (s. 10 CE) <i>Commentarius in Gregorii Nazianzeni Orationes</i>		CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (c. 150–c. 215 CE) <i>Protrepticus</i>	
31.16 (<i>Hermes</i> 27.614–15)	61C	2.30.3–7 (GCS 1.22.14–23.7 Stählin)	44A
CICERO, M. TULLIUS (106–3 BCE) <i>Academici libri</i>		<i>Stromateis</i> 2.21.127 (GCS 2.181.28–182.14 Stählin-Früchtel-Treu)	3B no. 6, 12
2.131 = <i>Lucullus</i> 131 (BT 93.24–94.13 Plasberg)	3B no. 3, 13A	DAMASCIUS (c. 460–540 CE) <i>De principiis</i>	
		123 (CB 3.159.10–162.18 Westerink)	61A

254 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

DIIOGENES LAERTIUS (s. 3 CE) <i>Vitae philosophorum</i> 1.26 (BT 1.19.5–12) 1B no. 8, 47 1.27 (BT 1.19.13–20.4) 48 2.13–14 (BT 1.100.15–101.8) 49 2.26 (BT 1.109.8–17) 1B no. 9, 53A 2.105 (BT 1.163.5–10) 54 4.40–2 (BT 1.286.1–287.3) 3B no. 7, 4 4.42 (BT 1.287.3–14) 5 5.67–8 (BT 1.356.9–14) 3B no. 8, 6 8.21 (BT 1.585.8–14) 50 8.57–8 (BT 1.608.16–609.9) 52 9.15–16 (BT 1.641.7–16) 51 9.112 (BT 1.706.3–8) 3B no. 9, 7 DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS (s. 1 BCE) <i>De compositione verborum</i> 4 = Hieronymus Cardius T 12 [67] <i>De Isocrate</i> 13 (CB 1.130.7–131.15 Aujac) 38B ETYMOLOGICUM GUDIANUM (s. 11 CE compositum) s.v. ἀλκαία (1.90.14–15, 91.17–19 De Stefani) 45 EUSTATHIUS THESSALONICENSIS (s. 12 CE) <i>Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem</i> 11.1 (3.133.20–134.4 van der Valk) 46B IAMBlichUS (c. 245–c. 325 CE) <i>De anima</i> (apud Stobaei <i>Anthologium</i>) 34–5 Finamore-Dillon 15 INSCRIPTIONES GVI: vid. IG IG 12.1 141 = GVI 1916 58 <i>ILind.</i> 2 C.65–74 60B 2 D.1–59 60A <i>Die östgriechischen Grabreliefs</i> 2085 PM 2 PAPYRI <i>PHerc.</i>: vid. Philodemus <i>POxy.</i> 3656 1B no. 1, 55	PHILODEMUS GADARENSIS (s. 1 BCE) <i>De rhetorica</i> 4 <i>PHerc.</i> 1007, col. 16a.5–18a.8 (BT 1.197–200 Sudhaus) 38A <i>De Stoicis</i> <i>PHerc.</i> 339, col. 8.1–19 56 <i>Stoicorum historia</i> <i>PHerc.</i> 1018, col. 48.1–3 8B, 24 PHOTIUS (s. 9 CE) <i>Lexicon</i> (c. 830 CE compositum) α 1432 s.v. Ἀναγυράσιος δαίμων (149.6–14 Theodoridis) 8A no. 3c, 42A app. PLUTARCHUS CHAERONENSIS (c. 50–c. 120 CE) <i>Moralia</i> <i>Apophthegmata Laconica</i> 209E–F (BT 2.115.21–116.2 Nachstädt) 36B <i>De cohibenda ira</i> 4 454E–F (BT 3.161.22–162.13 Pohlenz) 8B no. 3, 25 11–12 460B–C (BT 3.176.4–22) 26 <i>De recta ratione audiendi</i> 18 48A–B (BT 1.96.3–15 Paton) 32 <i>De Stoicorum repugnantibus</i> 2 1033B–C (BT 6.2.2.9–3.4 Pohlenz) 23 <i>Non posse suaviter vivi secundum</i> <i>Epicurum</i> 13 1096A–C (BT 6.2.146.10– 47.10 Pohlenz) 3B, 40 <i>Quaestiones convivales</i> 1 612D–E (BT 4.2.4–19 Hubert) 9 1.8 626A–B (BT 4.34.9–35.2) 10 <i>Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata</i> 191A (BT 2.59.16–19 Nachstädt) 36C <i>Vitae</i> <i>Agesilaus</i> 13.5–7 603B–C (BT 3.2.233.12– 234.3 Ziegler) 36A <i>Alexander</i> 32.8–11 684B–C (BT 2.2.197.10– 22 Ziegler) 1B no. 10, 59C <i>Aristides</i> 27.2–4 335B–D (BT 1.1.286.5–23 Ziegler) 53C PORPHYRIO, POMPONIUS (s. 3 CE) <i>Commentarii in Horati Epistulis</i> 1.6.65 (325.22–6 Holder) 21
---	---

RUFINUS GRAMMATICUS (s. 5 CE)	ε 1137 s.v. ἐναύειν (2.270.15–17)	42B
<i>De numeris oratorum</i>	κ 1778 s.v. Κλήμης (3.132.28–9)	39
573.22–5 Keil (<i>GL</i> 6)		37B
SCHOLIA	TERTULLIANUS, Q. SEPTIMIUS FLORENS	
in Homeri <i>Iliadem</i>	(c. 160–c. 240 CE)	
11.1 (3.123.1–5 Erbse)	<i>De anima</i>	
46A	46.9 (64.7–15 Waszink)	43C
SENECA, LUCIUS ANNAEUS (c. 4 BCE–65 CE)	THEO ALEXANDRINUS (s. 1 BCE)	
<i>De ira</i>	<i>Vita Arati</i> III	
1.19.1–3 (OCT 57.29–58.7	14b12–15b32 Martin	57A
Reynolds)	<i>Vitae Arati versio Latina</i>	
27	146b13–148b9 Maas	57B
STOBAEUS, JOANNES (s. 5 CE)	TIMACHIDAS RHODIUS (s. 2–1 BCE)	
<i>Anthologium</i>	<i>Tabula de donis votivis</i>	
1.49.42 (1.382.17–383.14	32 = <i>ILind.</i> 2 C.65–74	60B
Wachsmuth)	15	
2.31.121 (2.233.1–16)	<i>Tabula de prodigiis</i>	31
31	1 = <i>ILind.</i> 2 D.1–59	60A
STRABO (s. 1 BCE)		
<i>Geographica</i>		
8.6.21 = Hieronymus Cardius F 16 [64]	VITA ARISTOTELIS HESYCHII	
9.5.22 = Hieronymus Cardius F 17 [65]	9 (82.18–21 Düring)	3A
10.4.3 = Hieronymus Cardius F 18 [66]	VITA SOPHOCLES	
14.2.13 655 (3.130.18–131.2	12 (<i>TGrF</i> 3.34.41–6 Radt)	43A
Kramer)		1A, 8B no. 4
SUDA (s. 10 CE compositum)	ZENOBIUS (s. 2 CE)	
<i>Lexicon</i>	<i>Proverbia, vel potius Epitomae</i>	
α 1842 s.v. Ἀναγυράσιος	<i>proverbiorum Lucilli Tarrhaei et</i>	
(1.165.17–27 Adler)	<i>Didymi recensio vulgata</i>	
ε 78 s.v. ἐγκατωκοδόμησεν	1.56 (<i>CPG</i> 1.22.13–16)	59B
(2.193.10–12)	2.55 (<i>CPG</i> 1.46.8–15)	42A app. 42C

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

This Index lists all passages cited in the upper (or lower) apparatus or in the notes (n.) to the translations, except those in which Hieronymus is named (see Index of Sources).

ACHAEUS ERETREIUS (s. 5 BCE)		[ALEXANDER APHRODISIENSIS]	
F 9 <i>TGrF</i> 20	29	<i>Problemata</i> (Ideler)	
[ACRO]		1.74	10
<i>Scholia in Horatii Epistulas</i> (Keller)		2.64	10
1.6.65	21	AMMONIUS (c. 445–c. 520 CE)	
ADESPOTA		<i>In Aristotelis De interpretatione</i>	
F 1008 <i>PMG</i>	40	(Busse)	
F 1020	63	13 (<i>CAG</i> 4.5 249.1–11)	52
AELIANUS, CLAUDIUS (s. 2–3 CE)		ANACREON TEUS (s. 6 BCE)	
<i>De natura animalium</i> (Hercher)		F 356 <i>PMG</i>	29
5.39	45	ANAXAGORAS CLAZOMENIUS (s. 5 BCE)	
6.1	45	A 1.13–14 DK 59	49
<i>Varia historia</i> (Dilts)		A 3	49
2.4	35, 35 n.	A 15	49
3.23	30	A 17	49
4.13	12	A 18	49
<i>Fragmenta</i>		A 19	49
F 246 Hercher = 244b		A 38	49
Domingo–Forasté	42B	ANAXIMENES LAMPSACENUS (s. 4 BCE)	
AENEAS GAZAEUS (s. 5 CE)		F 27 <i>FGrH</i> 72	63
<i>Theophrastus</i>		ANTAGORAS RHODIUS (s. 3 BCE)	
901C <i>PG</i> 85 = 17.21–4		F 4 <i>CA</i>	57A
Colonna	50	ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA	
AESCHINES ORATOR (c. 390–314 BCE)		7.95	49
<i>Orationes</i> (Dilts)		ANTIGONUS CARYSTIUS (s. 3 BCE)	
1.74	54, 54 n.	F 7 Dorandi	7
3.258	53C	F 9	54 n.
AESCHYLUS (c. 525–455 BCE)		F 29	57A
F 357 Radt	25	ANTIOCHUS ASCALONIUS (s. 2–1 BCE)	
AESOPICA		F 5 Mette	13A
<i>Fabulae</i>		F 9	11, 14, 16D
46 Perry = 46 Hausrath	34 n.	F 9a	16B, 18C
AETIUS (fl. 100 CE)		F 9b	16C
<i>Placita philosophorum</i> (Diels)		F 10	16A, 17
1.3.1	48	ANTISTHENES ATHENIENSIS (s. 5–4 BCE)	
4.2.1	48	5 A 38 <i>SSR</i> 2 = A 1 DK 66	51
ALCIMUS SICULUS (s. 4 BCE)		APOLLODORUS ATHENIENSIS (s. 2 BCE)	
F 3 <i>FGrH</i> 560	26	<i>Bibliotheca</i> (Wagner)	
ALEXANDER AETOLUS (s. 3 BCE)		3.10.7	44A
T 5 Magnelli	57A, 57B	3.11.2	44A

APOLLONIUS MOLO (s. 2–1 BCE)		ARISTOTELES (384–322 BCE)	
T 1a <i>FGrH</i> 728	1A	<i>Athenaion Politeia</i>	
APOLLONIUS RHODIUS (s. 3 BCE)		1	35
<i>Argonautica</i>		<i>De anima</i>	
4.1614	45, 45 n.	1.5 411a7–8	48
APOSTOLIUS, MICHAEL (s. 15 CE)		<i>De partibus animalium</i>	
1.99 (<i>CPG</i> 2.265)	59B	3.4	26 n.
2.96 (<i>CPG</i> 2.286)	42A	3.7	26 n.
9.79 (<i>CPG</i> 2.479)	42A	<i>Ethica Nichomachea</i>	
9.99 (<i>CPG</i> 2.483)	42B	1.10 1101a14–16	18C
16.57 (<i>CPG</i> 2.676)	46A	4.5	25 n.
APULEIUS MADAURENSIS (s. 2 CE)		7.6	25 n.
<i>De Platone</i> (Moreschini)		<i>Metaphysica</i>	
1.1	43C	1.3 983b20–84a3	48
ARATUS SOLEUS (c. 315–240 BCE)		1.3 983b30	61B
F 115 <i>SH</i>	57A	<i>Politica</i>	
ARCESILAUS PITANAEUS (315–241 BCE)		1.11 1259a6–19	47
T 1a Mette	4, 5	1.11 1259a17	47, 47 n.
ARISTON (ante s. 1 BCE)		3.5 1278a28–34	53 n.
509 <i>FGrH</i>	60A, 60B	5.11 1313a34–b32	35 n.
ARISTIPPUS CYRENAEUS (s. 5–4 BCE)		<i>Rhetorica</i>	
4 A 99 <i>SSR</i> 2	4	2.2–3	25 n.
4 A 178	13A	2.2 1378a30–2	26, 26 n.
4 A 183	18C	2.3 1380a9–12	26
4 A 184	16B	3.2 1405a31–4	35 n.
4 A 185	20A	3.8	37A n., 37B
4 A 187	16D	3.9 1409b17–23	38A
4 A 198	12	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
4 A 204	20B	T 76b Düring	11
ARISTO CEUS (s. 3 BCE)		10.19–22 Rose = 26a33–6 Gigon	3A
F 4A SFOD = 7 Wehrli	3A	F 7 Rose	50 n.
F 8 SFOD = 10 Wehrli	11	F 37	43B n.
F 16 SFOD = 33 Wehrli	46A	F 65	52
F 18 SFOD = 12 Wehrli	46A	F 70	52
ARISTO CHIUS (s. 3 BCE)		F 93	53A, 53B, 53C
F 345 <i>SVF</i> 1	4	F 99–101	9
F 336	14	F 100–11	9n.
F 363	16A, 16B	F 110–11	29 n.
F 379	15	F 108	9n.
ARISTOPHANES (c. 455–386 BCE)		F 533	41
<i>Lysistrata</i>		F 608	26
67–8	42C, 42C n.	F 611.69	17 n.
<i>Fragmenta</i>		F 615–17	41 n.
F 41–66 KA	42A	F 651–70	30 n.
ARISTOPHANES BYZANTIUS (s. 3–2 BCE)		[ARISTOTELES]	
<i>Epitome</i> (Lambros)		<i>Problemata</i>	
2.157	45	3.4	30, 30 n.
ARISTOPHANES PERIPATETICUS		3.7	29
T 1 <i>CPF</i> 1.1.23	55	3.11	30, 30 n.

258 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

3.33	30, 30 n.	11 498A–500C	29 n.
8.9	10 n.	11 500B	29 n.
11.25	40	12 518B	26
12.1	10	12 546D	55
12.2	10	13 555B	53B n.
12.4	10	13 557E	34
12.9	10	13 558E	53B n.
31.14	10	13 561F–562A	35
31.25	10	13 571A–610B	34 n.
<i>Problemata Inedita</i> (Bussemaker)		13 601D–605A	34 n., 35 n.
2.27	10 n.	13 603E	33
2.102	10	13 603E–F	35
ARISTOXENUS TARENTINUS (s. 4 BCE)		14 623E–639A	41 n.
<i>Harmonica</i> (Da Rios)		14 635B	41
21	40	ATHENAGORAS (s. 2 CE)	
<i>Fragmenta</i>		<i>Legatio pro Christianis</i> (Marcovich)	
F 31 Wehrli	35 n.	4–17	61B n.
F 54a–b	53A, 53C	17.1	61B
F 57	53B	18–22	61B n.
F 58	53C	18.5	61B n.
F 97	41	20	61B n.
F 98	41	20.3	61A
F 99–101	41	29.1	44A
F 122–7	9 n.	32.1	61B n.
F 127	40		
ARIUS DIDYMUS (s. 1 BCE–1 CE): vid.		CALLIMACHUS CYRENAEUS (s. 3 BCE)	
Stobaeus		F 36–7 Pfeiffer	59C n.
ARNOBIUS SICCENSIS (fl. 300 CE)		F 177.23 = <i>SH</i> 259.23	45, 45 n.
<i>Adversus nationes</i> (Marchesi)		CALLISTHENES OLYNTHIUS (s. 4 BCE)	
1.36	44A	F 36–7 <i>FGrH</i> 124	59C n.
1.41	44A	F 43	53B
4.21–8	44B n.	F 48	53C
4.24	44A	CARNEADES CYRENAEUS (s. 2 BCE)	
4.27	46A	F 5 Mette	13A
ARRIANUS, FLAVIUS (s. 2 CE)		F 6	16B, 16C, 16D
<i>Anabasis</i> (Roos)		F 7a	16A, 17
2.20	59C n.	CARYSTIUS PERGAMENUS (s. 2 BCE)	
ATHENAEUS NAUCRATITES (s. 2–3 CE)		F 4 <i>FHG</i> 4.357	30
<i>Deipnosophistae</i> (Kaibel)		[CERCOPS]	
5 192B	28, 28 n.	DK 15	50 n.
5 206D–209E	62 n.	CHAMAELEON PONTICUS (c. 350–c.280 BCE)	
5 209B	62 n.	F 10 Wehrli	29, 29 n.
7 279E–F	55	CHRYSIPPUS SOLEUS (c. 280–c.205 BCE)	
10 420D	4 n.	F 14 <i>SVF</i> 3	16B
10 424E–425F	28 n.	F 21	13B
10 427A–C	29	F 333–9	15, 15 n.
10 429B	30 n.	F 395–8	25 n., 26 n.
10 434 A–D	30	F 685–704	23 n.
10 434 A–435D	30 n.	F 702	23

CICERO, M. TULLIUS (106–43 BCE)	2.19–22	44A n.
<i>Academici libri</i> (Plasberg)	3.45	17 n.
1.33–5	5.12	16A n.
2.64–111	5.12–82	16A n.
2.116–46	5.24–5	17 n.
2.129–30	5.51	17 n.
<i>De divinatione</i> (Giomini)	CLEANTHES ASSIUS (c. 330–230 BCE)	
1.5	F 519 SVF 1	51
1.6	CLEARCHUS SOLEUS (s. 4 BCE)	
1.39	F 56 Wehrli	46A
1.39–51	F 73	53B n.
1.39–71	CLEMENS (s. 1 CE?)	
1.55–9	FHG 4.464	39
1.64	CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (c. 150–c. 215 CE)	
1.70–1	<i>Protrepticus</i> (Stählin)	
1.72–108	2.26–40	44A n.
1.111	47 <i>Stromateis</i> (Stählin)	
<i>De finibus</i> (Reynolds)	1.21 131.6	41
2.31	2.21 128–33	12 n.
2.39–42	20A n. [CLEMENS ROMANUS] vel potius	
2.44	13B CLEMENTINA	
2.75	18B <i>Homiliae</i> (Rehm)	
2.77	18B 6.5	61A
3.30–1	13B 6.6	61B, 61C
5.9–12	11 n. 6.12	61B
5.12	17 n. CODICES	
5.16	12 n. Coislinianus 177 → PAROEMIOGRAPHICA	
5.16–22	16D n. Leidensis → GREGORIUS CYPRIUS	
5.23	15 n. Mosquensis → GREGORIUS CYPRIUS	
5.73–4	14 n. CONON MYTHOGRAPHUS (s. 1 BCE–1 CE)	
5.85–6	17 n. F 1.18 FG ^{Gr} H 26	43C
5.91	17 n. CRITOLAUS PHASELITES (s. 2 BCE)	
<i>De natura deorum</i> (Plasberg–Ax)	F 3 Wehrli	3A
2.62	44A n. F 11	11
3.11	44A CURTIUS RUFUS, QUINTUS (s. 1 CE)	
3.39	44A n. <i>Historiae Alexandri Magni</i> (Bardon)	
3.41	44A 4.13.25	59C
3.45	44A n. CYRILLUS ALEXANDRINUS (s. 4–5 CE)	
3.57	44A <i>Contra Julianum</i> (Spanheim)	
<i>Orator</i> (Westman)	6.186	53A
54–60	37A n.	
56	38A n. DAMASCIUS (c. 460–c. 540 CE)	
163–7	37A n. <i>De principiis</i> (Westerink)	
168–238	37A n. 1–42	61A n.
172–6	37AB 43–89	61A n.
190	38B 50	61A
<i>Tusculanae disputationes</i> (Pohlenz)	55	61A
2.14	20B n. 53	61A
2.15–18	20B n. 90–126	61A n.

260 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

98	61A	DIAGENES LAERTIUS (s. 3 CE)	
111	61A n.	<i>Vitae philosophorum</i> (Marcovich)	
111–22	61A n.	1.110	35
123	61A n.	2.6–15	49 n.
124	61B, 61B n.	2.12	49
124–5	61A n.	2.12–13	49 n.
DEMETRIUS PHALEREUS (s. 4–3 BCE)		2.15	49
F 104 SOD = 96 Wehrli	53C	2.18–47	53A
F 105 SOD = 94 Wehrli	53B	2.31	54, 54 n.
F 133 SOD = 170 Wehrli	38B n.	2.87	12
F 134 SOD = 169 Wehrli	38A,	2.105	54 n.
	38A n.	2.110	56, 56 n.
F 149 SOD	30 n.	2.133	57A
DEMETRIUS RHETOR		2.143	57A
<i>De Elocutione</i> (Radermacher)		3.7	43C
188	37A, 37A n.	3.46	55
247	38A n.	4.2	55
301	37A n.	4.16	4 n.
DEMOCRITUS (s. 5–4 BCE)		4.17	32
A 166–9 DK 68	15	4.18–19	32
DEMOSTHENES (384–322 BCE)		4.21	57A n.
<i>Orationes</i>		4.22	5 n.
20.115	53C	4.26–7	57A n.
23.53	42A	4.29–30	5 n.
DICAEARCHUS MESSANIUS (s. 4 BCE)		4.33	4 n.
F 11B Mirhady = 70 Wehrli	30 n.	4.34	5 n.
F 30–1 Mirhady = 13–16		4.37	5 n.
Wehrli	43B n.	4.38–9	6 n.
F 50 Mirhady = 44 Wehrli	55	4.41	6
F 67 Mirhady = 54 Wehrli	44A	4.43	5 n.
F 96 Mirhady = 74 Wehrli	40	4.46–7	57A
DIODORUS SICULUS (s. 1 BCE)		5.52	3A
<i>Bibliotheca</i> (Vogel-Fischer)		5.87	35
3.61	44A, 44A n.	6.19	51
12.39.2	49	6.54	47
18.26–8	62, 62 n.	7.6–15	4 n.
20.91	62 n.	7.6–9	57, 57 n.
DIODORUS TYRIUS (s. 2 BCE)		7.7–9	56 n.
F 3a Wehrli	16B	7.35	24 n.
F 3b	16C	7.36	4 n., 57A
F 4a	18C	7.84	24 n.
F 4c	11	7.89	12
F 4e	14	7.113	25 n.
F 4f	16A	7.160–4	14 n.
F 4g	13A	7.165–6	14 n.
F 4h	12	7.169	4 n.
F 5	17	7.174	51

7.178	51	A 2	52 n.
8.1–50	50 n.	A 19	
8.41	50, 50 n.	A 23	52
8.43	50	B 134	52
8.51–77	52 n.	T 2 <i>TGrF</i> 50	52
8.52	56 n.	ENNIUS, QUINTUS (239–169 BCE)	
8.77	52	F 173 Jocelyn	20A
9.1–17	51 n.	EPAPHRODITUS (s. 1 CE)	
9.12	51	F 51 Luenzner	45
9.112	7 n.	F 52	45
9.115	5 n.	EPHORUS CUMAEUS (s. 4 BCE)	
10.28	9	F 107 <i>FGrH</i> 70	37B
10.121	40	EPICURUS (342–270 BCE)	
10.136	18B	F 1–2 Usener	18B
DIODEGENES SINOPEUS (s. 4 BCE)		F 1 n.	18B
5 B 200 <i>SSR</i> 2	47	F 57–65	9
DIODORUS SICULUS (s. 2 CE)		F 200	12
1.25 (<i>CPG</i> 1.184)	42C	F 397 n.	12
1.52 (<i>CPG</i> 1.189)	42C	F 398	19
2.7 (<i>CPG</i> 1.197)	59B	F 401	20B
3.31 (<i>CPG</i> 1.219)	42A	F 406	12
8.37 (<i>CPG</i> 1.312)	46A	F 419	20A
DIONYSIUS CHALCUS (s. 5 BCE)		F 426	23
T 1 West	35	F 450	12
DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS (s. 1 BCE)		F 499	22
<i>De Demosthene</i> (Aujac)		F 511	22
4.4	38B n.	F 569	40
5.6	38B, 38B n.	F 602	12
18.7–8	38B n.	p. 115.3–6 Usener	9
<i>De Isocrate</i> (Aujac)		EPIMENIDES CRETICUS (s. 7–6 BCE)	
2–3	38B n.	A 4 DK 3	35
2.5–6	38B	ERGIAS RHODIUS (s. 4 BCE)	
2.7	38B	F 3 <i>FGrH</i> 513	60A
4–10	38B n.	ETYMOLOGICUM MAGNUM (s. 12 CE)	
11–14	38B n.	compositum)	
12	38B n.	66.5 Gaisford	45
12.3	38B	85.15	28
13.3–4	37B	EUDEMUS RHODIUS (s. 4 BCE)	
13.5	37B	F 2 Wehrli	1A
13.6	37A	F 133	48
14	38B n.	F 150	61B, 61B n.
15–20	38B n.	F 2 <i>FGrH</i> 525	60B
DIONYSIUS SCYTOBRACHION (s. 3 BCE)		F 3	60A
F 7 <i>FGrH</i> 32	44A, 44A n.	EUPHANTUS OLYNTHIUS (s. 4 BCE)	
DIPHILUS (s. 4 BCE)		F 3 <i>FGrH</i> 74	56
F 11 KA	42A	2 D 1 <i>SSR</i> 1	56
EMPEDOCLES AGRIGENTINUS (s. 5 BCE)		EURIPIDES (c. 485–406 BCE)	
A 1.57 DK 31	52	<i>Alceste</i>	
		3–4	44A n.

262 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

<i>Bacchae</i>		HELLANICUS LESBIUS (s. 5 BCE)	
621	27	F 85a <i>FGrH</i> 4	41
<i>Hecuba</i>		F 85b	41, 41 n.
627–8	20A	F 87	61A
<i>Orestes</i>		F 140	46A
213	9	HERACLIDES LEMBUS (s. 2 BCE)	
<i>Fragmenta</i>		F 6 <i>FHG</i> 3.169	52
F 484 <i>TGF</i>	38B	HERACLIDES PONTICUS (s. 4 BCE)	
F 801–15	42A, 42A n.	F 39 Wehrli	51
EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS (265–340 CE)		F 65	35
<i>Praeparatio Evangelica</i> (Mras)		F 74–5	50 n.
5.35.2–3	35	HERILLUS CARTHAGINIENSIS (s. 3 BCE)	
EUSTATHIUS THESSALONICENSIS (s. 12 CE)		F 417 <i>SVF</i> 1	14
<i>Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem</i>		F 420	15
(van der Valk)		HERMIAS ALEXANDRINUS (s. 5 CE)	
20.168	45	<i>In Phaedrum</i> (Couvreur)	
<i>Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam</i>		243A	43C
(Stallbaum)		HERMIPPUS SMYRNAEUS (s. 3 BCE)	
1.130	59A	F 20 Wehrli	50, 50 n.
11.224	30	F 30	49
		HERODICUS BABYLONIUS (s. 2 BCE)	
GALENUS (129–199 CE)		22.4–19 Düring	63
<i>De simplicium medicamentorum</i>		HERODOTUS (s. 5 BCE)	
<i>temperamentis ac facultatibus</i>		2.53	61B
16 (11.829 Kuhn)	42C	2.81	50 n.
GELLIUS, AULUS (s. 2 CE)		6.43–5	60A n.
<i>Noctes Atticae</i> (Marshall)		6.84	29, 29 n.
2.18.3	54	6.94	60A n., 60B n.
15.20.6–7	33, 53A, 53A n.	6.95–102	60A n.
GNOMOLOGIUM VATICANUM (s. 14 CE		6.97	60A n.
compositum)		6.118	60A n.
318	47	HESIODUS (s. 8 BCE)	
GORGAS LEONTINUS (s. 5–4 BCE)		<i>Theogonia</i>	
A 32 DK 82	37B	950–5	44A n.
GREGORIUS CYPRIUS (1241–90 CE)		984–5	46A n.
1.22 (<i>CPG</i> 1.351)	42C	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
<i>Codex Leidensis</i> : Vossianus 14		F 25 MW	44A n.
3.13 (<i>CPG</i> 2.87)	46A	F 51	44A
<i>Codex Mosquensis</i> : bibl. Synodi 283		[HESIODUS]	
1.22 (<i>CPG</i> 2.95)	42C	<i>Scutum</i>	
GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS (329–89 CE)		430–1	45 n.
<i>Orationes</i> (Gallay)		HESYCHIUS ALEXANDRINUS (s. 5 CE)	
31.16	61C	<i>Lexicon</i> (Latte)	
		α 4247	42C
HARPOCRATION (s. 2 CE)		α 4248	42C
<i>Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos</i>		γ 1029	29
(Keaney)		θ 523	28
α 109	42A	μ 1235	43A
		ο 904	42C

[HESYCHIUS]		15.141	28
<i>De viris illustribus</i> (Marcovich)		18.410	27
8	4, 5	20.268	27
HIERO (ante s. 1 BCE)		21.26	44A, 44A n.
518 <i>FGrH</i>	60A, 60B	[<i>Cypria</i>]	
HIERONYMUS AEGYPTIUS (ante s. 1 CE)		F 6 Davies	44A
F 3 <i>FGrH</i> 787	61A	[<i>Hymni</i>]	
HIERONYMUS CARDIUS (s. 4–3 BCE)		5.218–38	46A n.
T 9 <i>FGrH</i> 154	57A	HORATIUS FLACCUS, QUINTUS (65–8 BCE)	
F 1	63	<i>Epistulae</i>	
F 2	62	1.6.65–6	21
F 4	63 n.	HYGINUS (s. 2? CE)	
F 7	63 n.	<i>Fabulae</i> (Marshall)	
F 8	63 n.	257	35
F 10	63 n.		
F 19	56	IAMBlichus (c. 245–c. 325 CE)	
HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS (c. 347–420 CE)		<i>De vita Pythagorica</i> (Deubner)	
<i>Adversus Iovinianum</i> (Vallarsi)		12	48
1.48	53A	47–8	50
<i>Commentaria in Osee</i> (Adriaen)		50	50
1.1	54	55	50
HIPPOBOTUS (s. 3/2 BCE)		57	50
F 6a Gigante	55	234–6	35 n.
HIPPOCRATES COUS (s. 5 BCE)		INSCRIPTIONES	
<i>De affectionibus</i> (Porter)		<i>GVI</i>	
20	26, 26 n.	1451 Peek	4 n.
<i>De internis affectionibus</i> (Porter)		<i>IG I³</i>	
30–4	26, 26 n.	515	42A
<i>De locis in homine</i> (Craik)		<i>ILind</i>	
24	26, 26 n.	2	59B n., 59C n., 60A, 60A n.
HOMERUS (s. 8 BCE)		674	2 n.
<i>Ilias</i>		<i>IMG</i>	
3.243–4	44A	180 Preger	59A
6.155–70	42A n.	ION CHIUUS (s. 5 BCE)	
9.447–77	42A n.	F 6 <i>FGrH</i> 392	34
14.201	61B, 61B n.	F 25 = B 2 DK 36	50 n.
14.246	61B, 61B n.	ISOCRATES (436–338 BCE)	
14.302	61B, 61B n.	<i>Antidosis</i>	
18.117–19	44A n.	235	49
20.170–1	45 n.	<i>Panegyricus</i>	
<i>Odyssea</i>		45	37A n.
1.381	27	75–80	38B n.
5.1–2	46A n.	189	37A n.
9.82–105	23 n.		
9.222–3	29	JOSEPHUS, FLAVIUS (s. 1 CE)	
11.298–304	44A, 44A n.	<i>Contra Apionem</i> (Niese)	
11.602	44A	1.2	48
11.602–4	44A n.	2.265	49

264 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

JULIANUS, FLAVIUS CLAUDIUS (331–363 CE)	MOSCHION (s. 2 BCE?)	
<i>Epistulae</i>	F 1 <i>FGrH</i> 575	62
59 Hertlein = 82 Bidez	54 MYRON PRIENEUS (s. 3 BCE)	
	F 4 <i>FGrH</i> 106	60B
LACTANTIUS (c. 250–c. 325 CE)	F 5	60A
<i>Institutiones Divinae</i> (Brandt)		
3.25.15	54 NAUCRATES ERYTHRAEUS (s. 4 BCE)	
LEXICON Αἰμωδεῖν	F 1 B 31 Radermacher	37B
618.24 Sturz	45 NEANTHES CYZICENUS (s. 3 BCE)	
LEXICON BACHMANN (s. 8 CE compositum)	F 14–16 <i>FGrH</i> 84	35 n.
76.19 Bachmann	F 16	35
LIBANIUS (314–394 CE)	F 27	52
<i>Declamationes</i> (Foerster)	NEPOS, CORNELIUS (c. 110–24 BCE)	
26.21	42C <i>Aristides</i> (Marshall)	
<i>Epistulae</i> (Foerster)	3.3	53C
80.6	42C NICANDER COLOPHONIUS (s. 3 BCE)	
390.9	43A <i>Theriaca</i> (Jacquet)	
[LUCIANUS]	123	45
<i>Halcyon</i> (Macleod)	NICOMEDES ACANTHIUS (s. 4 BCE)	
8	53A F 2 <i>FGrH</i> 772	63
LYCO TROADIS (s. 3 BCE)	NONIUS MARCELLUS (s. 4 CE)	
F 1.34–40 SFOD = 11, 10 Wehrli	6	
F 1.94 SFOD = 15 Wehrli	29 n.	
F 3B SFOD = 6 Wehrli	3A	
F 11 SFOD = 17 Wehrli	11	
LYSIAS (s. c. 459–c. 380 BCE)	NOVUM TESTAMENTUM (s. 1 CE)	
<i>Orationes</i>	<i>Acta Apostolorum</i>	
1.31	42A n.	27 n.
	18.12–17	
MACARIUS CHRYSOCEPHALUS (c. 1306–82 CE)	OENOMAEUS GADARENSIS (s. 1–2 CE)	
1.67 (CPG 2.140–1)	59B F 12 Hammerstaedt	35
8.36 (CPG 2.219)	46A OLYMPIODORUS (s. 6 CE)	
MARSYAS PELLAEUS (s. 4 BCE)	<i>In Aristotelis Meteorologica</i> (Stüve)	
F 15 <i>FGrH</i> 135–6	63 1.3 (CAG 12 17.22–3)	49
MAXIMUS TYRIUS (s. 2 CE)	<i>Vita Platonis</i>	
<i>Dissertationes</i> (Trapp)	4 Hermann = 82–6 Westermann	43C
18.2	35 ORIGENES ADAMANTIUS (c. 185–255 CE)	
MENAECHMUS SICYONIUS (s. 4 BCE)	<i>Contra Celsum</i> (Borret)	
F 4 <i>FGrH</i> 131	41 1.64	54
MENANDER RHETOR (s. 3 CE)	3.67	54
1.2	52 6.8	43C
1.5	52 ORPHEUS	
MENEDEMUS ERETREIUS (s. 4–3 BCE)	A 1 DK 1	50 n.
3 F 12 SSR 1	57A B 12b	61A
3 F 25	55 B 13a	61A
MIMNERMUS SMYRNAEUS (s. 7 BCE)	B 13b	61B
F 1 West	21, 21 n. ORPHICA	
F 4	46A n. F 28 Kern	61B

F 54	61A	3 A 2	54
F 55–6	61A, 61B	3 A 3	54
F 56a	61A	3 A 8	54
F 56b	61A	PHAENIAS ERESIUS (c. 4 BCE)	
F 57	61B	F 11–13 Wehrli	35 n.
F 58	61A	F 14–16	35 n.
F 60	61A	F 33	41
F 66a	61A	PHERECYDES ATHENIENSIS (s. 5 BCE)	
F 70	61A	F 29 <i>FGH</i> 1	44A
F 72	61B	PHILOCHORUS ATHENIENSIS (s. 4–3 BCE)	
F 72–6	61A	F 126 <i>FGrH</i> 328	63
F 79	61A	F 175	44A
F 80	61A	F 175–6	44A n.
F 85–7	61A	PHILODEMUS GADARENSIS (s. 1 BCE)	
F 162	61A	<i>Academicorum historia: PHerc.</i> 1021	
F 297	61A	(Dorandi)	
		col. 13.20–7	32
PANAETIUS RHODIUS (c. 185–109 BCE)		col. 14.3–15	32
F 3 van Straaten = 4 Alesse	1A	col. 20.7–8	4 n.
F 132 van Straaten = 142 Alesse	53C	<i>De ira: PHerc.</i> 182 (Indelli)	
F 133 van Straaten = 143 Alesse	53B	col. 40.32–42.20	26 n.
PAPYRI		col. 43.41–46.16	25 n.
<i>PHerc.</i> → PHILODEMUS		col. 47.9–41	26 n.
<i>POxy.</i> → ARISTOPHANES PERIPATETICUS,		col. 49.27–50.8	26 n.
SATYRUS		<i>De pietate: PHerc.</i> 247 (Schober)	
PAROEMIOGRAPHICA		col. 4b.5–21	44A
<i>Bodleiana</i> , vel potius <i>Recensio B</i>		col. 5a.23–5b.3	44A
(s. 13 CE)		col. 6a.6–13	61B
56 Gaisford	42C	<i>De rhetorica</i> 4: <i>PHerc.</i> 1007 (Sudhaus)	
86	59B	col. 11a–19a	38A n.
<i>Coisliniana: Coislinianus</i> 177 (s. 15 CE)		PHOTIUS (s. 9 CE)	
30 Gaisford	42A	<i>Bibliotheca</i> (Henry)	
31	42C	Codex 167	31
PATROCLES THURIUS (s. 4 BCE)		Codex 186	43C
F 2 <i>TGrF</i> 57–8	44A, 44B	<i>Lexicon</i> (Theodoridis)	
PAUSANIAS MAGNES (s. 2 CE)		α 977	45
<i>Graeciae descriptio</i> (Rocha-Pereira)		α 1431	42A
1.2.3	57A	α 1432	42C
1.30.3	43C	α 1433	42A, 42C
3.19.12–13	43C	PINDARUS (c. 518–c. 445 BCE)	
PERSAEUS CITIEUS (s. 3 BCE)		<i>Isthmia</i> (Snell)	
F 435 <i>SVF</i> 1	57A	3.71 = 4.53	44A
F 439	57A	<i>Nemea</i>	
F 440	57A	10.55–90	44A
F 449	57A	<i>Pythia</i>	
F 459	57A	3.55–8	44A n.
F 460	57A	PISANDER CAMIRENSIS (s. 7/6 BCE)	
PHAEDO ELEUS (s. 5–4 BCE)		T 1 Davies	1A
3 A 1 SSR 1	54		

PLATO (428–347 BCE)		<i>Apophthegmata Laconica</i> (Nachstädt)	
<i>Alcibiades</i> 1		209E	36A
122B	31	<i>Coniugalia praecepta</i> (Wegehaupt)	
<i>Apology</i>		138F	25
34D	53A	<i>De cohibenda ira</i> (Pohlenz)	
<i>Cratylus</i>		455C	25
402B	61B	458D	27
408C	61A	<i>De exilio</i> (Sieveking)	
<i>Crito</i>		607F	49
44A–B	43B n.	<i>De Iside et Osiride</i> (Sieveking)	
<i>Gorgias</i>		364C	48
471	63 n.	<i>De liberis educandis</i> (Paton)	
471A	63	4A–B	31
503C	63	<i>De profectibus in virtutem</i> (Paton)	
<i>Phaedo</i>		78E	32
69A–C	15, 15 n.	<i>De recta ratione audiendi</i> (Paton)	
80D–E	15, 15 n.	37C	32 n.
89B–C	54 n.	42F–43B	32 n.
116B	53A	47C–48A	32 n.
<i>Phaedrus</i>		<i>De sera numinis vindicta</i> (Pohlenz)	
248C	61A n.	550E	26
270A	49	<i>De superstitione</i> (Paton)	
<i>Philebus</i>		169F	49
16E2	15	<i>Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum</i> (Pohlenz)	
<i>Respublica</i>		1095A	40
539B	32, 32 n.	<i>Praecepta gerendae reipublicae</i> (Hubert)	
553C	60A, 60B	807F–808A	36A
616C	61A, 61A n.	<i>Quaestiones convivales</i> (Hubert)	
<i>Symposium</i>	54 n.	1.6 623E	30, 30 n.
178D	35	1.8	9 n.
179A	35	2 praef. 629D	9, 9 n.
182C	35	2.1 634C	4 n.
<i>Timaeus</i>		2.2 635A–C	10 n.
37A5	61A	3.3	9 n.
40D–E	61A n.	3.5 652D	30
42E5	61A	3.6.3 654B–C	47
43A2	61A	6.8	10 n.
72C–D	26 n.	<i>Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata</i> (Nachstädt)	
PLINIUS SECUNDUS, GAIUS (23–79 CE)		191B	36A
<i>Naturalis historia</i> (CB)		<i>Septem sapientium convivium</i> (Paton)	
11.270	40	147A	48
36.82	48, 48 n.	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
PLOTINUS (205–270 CE)		F 6–7 Sandbach	44B
<i>Enneadae</i> (Henry–Schwyzer)		F 8	44B
1.2	15, 15 n.	<i>Vitae</i> (Ziegler)	
PLUTARCHUS CHAERONENSIS (c. 50–c. 120 CE)		<i>Agesilaus</i>	
<i>Moralia</i>		11–15	36A n.
<i>Amatorius</i> (Hubert)			
760B–C	35		

<i>Agis</i>		PORPHYRIUS TYRIUS (234–c. 305 CE)	
10.3	41 n.	<i>Ad Marcellam</i> (des Places)	
<i>Alexander</i>		30	12
4.5	30 n.	<i>Sententiae ad intelligibilia ducentes</i>	
<i>Aristides</i>		(Lamberz)	
1.1–2	53C	32	15, 15 n.
<i>Cicero</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
2	43B	F 215 Smith	53A
<i>Nicias</i>		POSIDONIUS APAMEUS (s. 2–1 BCE)	
23.4	49	T 2a Edelstein–Kidd	1A
<i>Pelopidas</i>		PRAXIPHANES MYTILENAEUS (s. 4–3 BCE)	
16–19	35 n.	F 1 Wehrli	1A
<i>Pericles</i>		F 3	3A
4	49	PROCLUS DIADOCHUS (c. 410–485 CE)	
32.5	49	<i>In primum Euclidis Elementorum librum</i>	
<i>Solon</i>		(Friedlein)	
6	47	65.7–11	48
12	35	PYRRHO ELEUS (c. 365–c. 275 BCE)	
[PLUTARCHUS]		F 69G Decleva Caizzi	20B
1.68 (CPG 1.332)	46A	F 69L	16A
POLEMO ATHENIENSIS (s. 4–3 BCE)		F 69M	16B
F 100 Gigante	32, 32 n.	PYTHAGORAS SAMIUS (s. 6–5 BCE)	
F 101	32, 32 n.	A 17–19 DK 14	50 n.
F 107	32		
F 108	32	RUFINUS, TYRANNIUS (c. 345–410 CE)	
F 125	13A	<i>Recognitiones</i> (Rehm)	
F 126	13B	10.17	61A
F 127	16B		
F 134	17	SATYRUS CALLATIANUS (s. 3–2 BCE)	
F 135	16C	<i>Vita Euripidis: POxy. 1176</i> (Arrighetti)	
POLEMO ILIENSIS (s. 3–2 BCE)		F 39 col. 10–12	33
F 53 Preller	35	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
POLLUX, JULIUS (s. 2 CE)		F 14 FHG 3.163	49, 49 n.
<i>Onomasticon</i> (Bethe)		F 15 FHG 3.163	53A, 53B
4.56	26	SCHOLIA	
4.118	28	in Apollonium Rhodium	
7.48	28	4.1614	45
7.77	28	in Aristophanis <i>Acharnenses</i>	
POLYBIUS MEGALOPOLITANUS (c. 200–c. 118 BCE)		688	46A
<i>Historiae</i> (Büttner–Wobst)		in Aristophanis <i>Lysistratam</i>	
4.52.2	4 n.	67–8	42C
POLYCLITUS THESSALUS (s.4 BCE)		150	28
F 4 FGrH 128	62	in Clementis <i>Protrepticum</i>	
POLYZELUS RHODIUS (s. 3 BCE)		2.30.7	44A
F 4 FGrH 521	60B	in Euripidis <i>Troades</i>	
F 5	60A	1057	33
		in Hesiodi <i>Scutum</i>	
		430–1	45

268 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

in Homeri <i>Iliadem</i>		1 B 57	53C
1.591	29	1 B 58	53A, 53B
3.151	46A n.	1 G 53	53A
20.170	45	1 G 90	53A
in Homeri <i>Odysseam</i>		<i>Socraticae Epistulae</i> (Koehler)	
9.5	23 n.	29.3	53A
9.222	29	SOPHOCLES (495–406 BCE)	
11.385	44A n.	<i>Antigone</i>	
11.604	44A n.	232	32, 32 n.
in Nicandri <i>Theriaca</i>		<i>Trachiniae</i>	
123a	45	1191–1202	44A
in Platonis <i>Rempublicam</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
600A	48	T 1.12 Radt	43A
in Sophoclis <i>Electram</i>		T 58a	33
62	50	T 75	34
SCYTHINUS TEUS (s. 5–4 BCE)		T 167b	43B
T 1 West = T 2 <i>FGrH</i> 13 = A 2		T 167c	43C
Diels 6	51	F 4 West = F 3 Diehl	34
SELEUCUS ALEXANDRINUS (s. 1 CE)		SOPHOCLES IUNIOR (s. 4 BCE)	
F 47 Mueller	29	F 1 <i>TGrF</i> 62	44A
SENECA, LUCIUS ANNAEUS (c. 4 BCE–65 CE)		SOSIBIUS LACON (s. 3 BCE)	
<i>De ira</i> (Reynolds)		F 3 <i>FGrH</i> 595	41
1.1.5–7	25	SOTION ALEXANDRINUS (s. 3–2 BCE)	
1.5–20	27 n.	F 3 Wehrli	49, 49 n.
1.17–18	26	SPEUSIPPUS ATHENIENSIS (c. 408–339 BCE)	
1.18.3–6	27 n.	T 1 Tarán	55
2.1.3	26 n.	T 39	55
2.2–4	25	T 46	9
3.1.3	25	F 78c	17
3.10.1–3	25	STATIUS, PUBLIUS PAPINIUS (45–96 CE)	
3.12.4	26	<i>Silvae</i>	
3.13.1–2	26	2.7.31–2	27 n.
<i>Epistulae morales</i> (Reynolds)		STEPHANUS BYZANTIUS (s. 6 CE)	
25.4	12	<i>Ethnica</i> (Meineke)	
<i>Quaestiones naturales</i> (Hine)		91.13	42A
4a praef. 10	27 n.	313.15–16	28
<i>Fragmenta</i>		STOBAEUS, JOANNES (s. 5 CE)	
F 62 Haase	53A	<i>Anthologium</i> (Wachsmuth, Hense)	
SIMPLICIUS (s. 6 CE)		1.48.8	15 n.
<i>In Aristotelis Physica</i> (Diels)		1.49.32–43	15 n.
1.2 (CAG 9 23.21–9)	48	2.1.16	15 n.
SOCRATES (469–399 BCE)		2.31.32	15 n.
1 B 7 <i>SSR</i> 1	53A, 53B	3.6.18	33
1 B 44	53A	3.25.6	15 n.
1 B 45	53A	4.22.58	47
1 B 48	53B	STRABO (s. 1 BCE)	
1 B 49	53C	<i>Geographica</i> (Kramer)	
1 B 52	53B	14.2.2–12	1A n.
1 B 54	53C		

STRATO LAMPSACENUS (c. 335–270 BCE)		A 10	47
F 3 Wehrli	3A	A 11	48
F 12	11	A 12	48
F 128–31	43C n.	A 13	48
F 150	30 n.	A 21	48
SUDA (s. 10 CE compositum)		A 22	48
Lexicon (Adler)		A 22a	48
α 1623	28	THEMISTIUS (s. 4 CE)	
α 1843	42C	<i>Orationes</i> (Downey–Norman)	
α 1981	49	32 358A–D	57A
α 3419	1A	THEODORETUS (s. 5 CE)	
α 3745	57A	<i>Graecarum affectionum curatio</i> (Raeder)	
δ 400	51	11.6	12
ε 1001	52, 52 n.	11.16	12
ε 1002	52 n.	12.64–7	53A
ε 1136	42B n.	THEODORUS BYZANTIUS (s. 5–4 BCE)	
ε 3695	33	F 16 B 12 Radermacher	37B
ζ 13	39 n.	THEOPHRASTUS ERESIUS (371–287 BCE)	
η 88	50	<i>De causis plantarum</i> (Einarson–Link)	
η 481	39 n.	6.5.1	40
κ 1638	42C	6.14.8	30 n.
λ 377	53A	6.17.1	10
ο 36	42C	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
π 89	39 n.	F 11 no. 7 FHS&G	3A
π 1707	43C	F 18 no. 2	5 n.
π 3124	50	F 18 no. 19	11
σ 578	46A	F 157	30 n.
σ 829	53A	F 225	48
φ 154	54, 54 n.	F 374	30 n.
φ 550	28	F 480A	14
		F 499	17
TERPANDER LESBIUS (s. 7 BCE)		F 569–76	30 n.
T 1 Campbell	41 n.	F 576	28
T 2	41	F 578	30
T 5	41 n.	F 579B	30 n.
T 8	41 n.	F 588	30 n.
T 18–20	41 n.	F 698	37B
TERTULLIANUS, QUINTUS SEPTIMIUS FLORENS		F 715	40
(c. 160–c. 240 CE)		F 727 no. 15–16	30 n.
De anima (Waszink)		THEOPOMPUS CHIU (s. 4 BCE)	
28.2–3	50	115 F 279 <i>FGrH</i>	63
45–9	43C n.	THRASYMACHUS CHALCEDONIUS (s. 5–4 BCE)	
46.4–9	43C n.		
46.10	43C n.	A 12 DK 85	37B
46.11	43C n.	THUCYDIDES (c. 460–c. 400 BCE)	
THALES MILESIUS (s. 7–6 BCE)		2.65.6	63
A 1.26 DK 11	47	6.54–9	35 n.
A 1.27	48	TIMAEUS TAUROMENIUS (s. 4–3 BCE)	
A 3	48	F 112 <i>FGrH</i> 566	62

270 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

TIMO PHLIASius (c. 325–c.235 BCE)		XENOPHON ATHENIENSIS (c. 430–c. 354 BCE)	
B 1 Diels = 1 Di Marco	7	<i>Anabasis</i>	
SH 775 = 1 Diels	7 n.	3.1.11–13	43B n.
SH 794 = 65 Diels	5, 5 n.	<i>Cynegetica</i>	
SH 805–7 = 31–3 Diels	5 n.	5.33	40
SH 808 = 34 Diels	5	<i>Symposium</i>	
SH 809 = 35 Diels	5, 5 n.	8.32–3	35
SH 829 = 55 Diels	5 n.	8.34–5	35
TIMOCRITUS (s. 3/2 BCE)		ZENO CITIEUS (c. 330–262 BCE)	
FGrH 522	60A, 60B	F 27 SVF 1	23
VARRO, MARCUS TERENTIUS (116–27 BCE)		F 185	20B
<i>Saturae Menippeae</i> (Astbury)		F 262	23
F 544–8	46A	ZENO ELEATES (s. 5 BCE)	
VITAE		A 10 DK 29	52
<i>Vita Apollonii Rhodii</i>	1A	ZENO TARSENSIS (s. 3–2 BCE)	
<i>Vita Arati I</i>	57A	F 2 SVF 3	24
<i>Vita Arati IV</i>	57A	ZENOBIUS (s. 2 CE)	
<i>Vita Euripidis</i>	28, 33	<i>Proverbia, vel potius Epitomae proverbiorum Lucilli Tarrhaei et Didymi recensio vulgata</i>	
XENAGORAS (s. 3/2 BCE)		6.18 (CPG 1.166)	46A
F 24 FGrH 240	60A		
XENOCRATES CHALCEDONIUS (395–313 BCE)			
F 84 Heinze = 241 Isnardi Parente	17		
F 90 Heinze = 247 Isnardi Parente	16C		

INDEX OF NAMES

Numerals refer to translations of texts and notes (n.) to the translations.

- | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|
| Academics | 12 n., 16A | Antisthenes of Athens | 51 |
| Academy | 4 n., 13A, 13A n., 13B n.,
16C n., 54 n., 55 n., 57A n. | Apollo | 2 n., 28, 35, 41 n., 52 |
| Acesas of Cyprus or Patara | 59A, 59A n.,
59B | Apollodorus of Athens | 56, 56 n. |
| Achilles | 43C | Apollonius Molo | 1A, 1A n. |
| Acragas | 35, 35 n. | Apollonius of Rhodes | 1A, 45, 45 n. |
| Acusilaus | 61A n. | Apollonius the "Soft" | 1A |
| Adrasteia | 61A, 61A n. | Aratus of Soli | 57A, 57A n., 57B |
| Aelian | 35 n., 42B n. | Arcesilaus | 4, 4 n., 5, 6 n., 13A n.,
32 n., 54 n. |
| Aeschines | 38A n. | Archelaus of Macedon | 63, 63 n. |
| Aeschylus | 25 | Archimedes | 62 |
| Aether | 61A, 61A n. | Areopagus | 43B |
| Agésilas II of Sparta | 36A, 36A n., 36B,
36B n., 36C n. | Aridelos | 4, 4 n. |
| Ajax | 43C | Arideices of Rhodes | 4 n. |
| Alcibiades | 53C, 54, 54 n. | Aristides of Athens | 53A, 53B, 53C |
| Alexander I of Macedon | 63 n. | Aristion | 60A, 60B |
| Alexander III the Great | 30, 30 n., 40,
59A n., 59C, 59C n., 62, 62 n. | Aristippus of Cyrene | 4, 13A, 16B, 16D,
18C, 20A, 20B |
| Alexander of Aetolia | 57A, 57A n.,
57B | Aristo of Ceos | 3A, 6 n., 11 |
| Alexandria | 29 n., 37A n., 41 n., 45,
57A n., 62 | Aristo of Chios | 4, 14, 14 n., 15,
15 n., 16A, 16B, 20B |
| Alexinus of Elis | 56 n. | Aristodemus of Athens | 35 |
| Anacreon | 41 | Aristogeiton of Athens | 35 |
| Anagyrasian | 42A | Aristophanean | 37A, 37A n. |
| Anagyrous | 42A, 42A n., 42C | Aristophanes | 42C, 42C n. |
| Anagyrus | 42A, 42A n., 42C | Aristophanes of Byzantium | 55 n. |
| Anaxagoras of Clazomene | 49, 49 n. | Aristophanes the Peripatetic | 55, 55 n. |
| Anaximenes of Lampsacus | 63, 63 n. | Aristotle | 3A n., 9, 9 n., 11, 11 n., 12 n.,
13A, 13A n., 13B n., 14, 16C, 17,
18C, 25 n., 26, 28, 28 n., 29 n., 30,
30 n., 35 n., 37B, 40, 41 n., 43B n.,
47 n., 52, 53A, 53B, 53C, 60A n. |
| Antagoras of Rhodes | 57A, 57A n., 57B | Aristoxenus | 9 n., 41, 53A n., 53B,
53C, 55 n. |
| Andronicus of Rhodes | 1A | Arnobius | 44A n., 44B n. |
| Antigonus I of Macedon | 63 n. | Artaphernes | 60A n., 60B n. |
| Antigonus II Gonatas | 4, 4 n., 6 n., 56 n.,
57A, 57A n., 57B | Asclepius | 44A, 44A n. |
| Antigonus of Carystus | 4 n., 5 n., 6 n., 7,
7 n., 54 n., 57A n. | Athena | 59A, 59B, 59B n., 59C n.,
60A, 60A n. |
| Antiochus I Soter | 6 n. | Athenaeus | 30 n., 35 n., 53B n. |
| Antiochus II Theos | 6 n. | Athenagoras | 61B n., 61C n. |
| Antiochus of Ascalon | 11 n., 12 n., 13A,
13A n., 15 n., 16A n.,
16B n., 16C n., 16D n. | Athens | 3A n., 4 n., 28, 35 n., 42A n.,
53A, 53B n., 53C n., 57A n., 69A n. |

Attalus I Soter	6, 6 n.	Crito	54
Aurelius, Marcus	61B n.	Critolaus of Phaselis	3A, 11, 11 n., 12 n., 17 n.
Axiothea of Phlius	55 n.	Croton	50, 50 n.
Baal	44A n.	Cybele	5 n.
Basil Elachistos	61C n.	Cycnus	45 n.
Bion of Borysthene	25 n.	Cylon of Athens	35 n.
Boreas	34, 34 n.	Cynics	44A n., 56 n.
		Cynosouris	44A
Callicles	63 n.	Cyrenaics	12, 12 n., 13A, 18A n.
Callimachus	45 n.		
Calliphon	12, 12 n., 13A, 13B n., 14, 14 n., 16A, 16B, 16C, 17, 18C	Damascius	61A n., 61B n.
Callisthenes of Olynthus	36A n., 53B, 53C, 59C n.	Damatrios	2
Callixeina of Thessaly	30	Damon of Syracuse	35 n.
Calpurnius Piso, Gnaeus	27 n.	Darius I	60A, 60B
Carneades of Cyrene	12 n., 13A, 13A n., 16A, 16A n., 16B, 16B n., 16C, 16D, 16D n., 17, 18C n.,	Darius III	59C n., 62 n.
Carneia	41, 41 n.	Datis	60A, 60A n., 60B n.
Carystius of Pergamum	30, 30 n.	Dawn	46A, 46A n., 46B
Carystus	59B, 59B n.	Deinomachus	12, 12 n., 16A, 16B
Castor	44A	Delos	60A n.
Chaos	61A, 61A n.	Delphi	35, 41 n., 59A
<i>Chaldean Oracles</i>	61A n.	Demetrius I the Besieger	57A, 57A n., 57B, 62, 62 n.
Chariton of Acragas	35	Demetrius of Phalerum	30 n., 38A, 38A n., 53B, 53C
Chremonidean War	4 n.	Democritus	15, 15 n.
Christians	44B n., 61B n.	Demosthenes	38A n.
Chrysippus of Soli	13A n., 13B, 13B n., 23, 23 n., 24 n., 43B n.	Dicaearchus of Messana	30 n., 36A n., 40, 43B n., 44A, 44A n., 44B n.
Cicero, Marcus Tullius	11 n., 13A n., 13B n., 16A n., 16B n., 16C n., 17 n., 18A n., 18B n., 18C n., 19 n., 20A n., 20B n., 22 n., 37A n., 37B, 37B n., 43B n., 43C, 43C n., 44A n.	Dio of Alexandria	9
Cicero, Quintus Tullius	43B n.	Diocleides	62, 62 n.
Cilicia	60A n.	Diodorus Cronus	56 n.
Cleanthes of Assos	4 n., 23, 23 n., 51	Diodorus of Tyre	11, 11 n., 12, 13A, 14, 14 n., 16A, 16B, 16C, 17, 18C
Clement	39	Diodotus	51
Clement of Alexandria	44A n., 44B n.	Diogenes of Babylon	56 n.
Cleomenes I of Sparta	29 n.	Diogenes Laertius	
Commodus, Lucius Aelius Aurelius	61B n.	<i>Life of Anaxagoras</i>	49 n.
Corinth	64	<i>Life of Arcesilaus</i>	4 n., 5 n., 6
Crantor of Soli	57A n.	<i>Life of Empedocles</i>	52 n.
Cratinus of Athens	35	<i>Life of Heraclitus</i>	51 n.
Cratippus	43B n., 43C n.	<i>Life of Lyco</i>	6 n.
Crete	66	<i>Life of Phaedo</i>	54 n.
		<i>Life of Pythagoras</i>	50 n.
		<i>Life of Socrates</i>	53A n.
		<i>Life of Thales</i>	47 n.
		<i>Life of Timon</i>	7 n.

Dionysius	51	Ge: <i>see</i> Earth	
Dionysius I of Syracuse	62, 62 n.	Gorgias of Leontini	37B
Dionysius of Athens "the Brazen"	35	Gregory of Nazianzus	61C n.
Dionysius of Halicarnassus	38B n.	Gude, M.	45 n.
Dionysius Scytobrachion	44A n.		
Dionysius Thrax	1A	Hades	44A n., 50
Dionysus	9, 9 n.	Hadrian	42C n.
Dioscuri	44A, 44A n., 44B	Halcyoneus	4, 4 n., 6
		Harmodius of Athens	35
Earth	61B, 61C	Hecate	58
Egg	61A, 61A n., 61B, 61C	Hegemon	56, 56 n.
Egypt	48	Helicon of Cyprus or Carystus	59A, 59A n., 59B, 59C
Empedocles of Acragas	52, 52 n.	Helios	34, 34 n., 60A, 60A n.
Empedocles the younger	52 n.	Hellanicus of Lesbos	41, 41 n., 46A n., 61A, 61A n., 61B n.
Ennius, Quintus	20A	Hemon of Chios	5 n.
Epameinon of Athens	63	Hera	61B n.
Epaminondas	35	Heracles	33 n., 43A, 43B, 44A, 44A n., 44B, 45 n., 61A, 61A n., 61B, 61C
Epaphroditus	46, 46 n.	Heraclides of Lembos	52, 52 n.
Epicureans	4 n., 5 n., 16B n., 18A n., 18B n., 19 n., 22 n., 23 n., 26 n., 40 n., 56 n.	Heraclides of Pontus	35, 51
Epicurus	9, 12, 12 n., 13A, 16A, 16B, 16C, 17, 18A, 18A n., 18C, 19, 19 n., 20A n., 20B, 22, 22 n., 23, 23 n., 40	Heraclitus	51 n.
Epimenides of Crete	35, 35 n., 61A n.	Herillus of Carthage	14, 14 n., 15, 15 n., 16A, 16B
Epirus	29	Hermes	58
Erebus	61A, 61A n.	Hermippus of Berytus	43C n.
Erechtheis	42A	Hermippus of Smyrna	49, 50 n., 52 n.
Eretria	60A n.	Herodicus of Babylon	63 n.
Ergias of Rhodes	60A	Herodotus	29 n., 60A n.
Erikepaios	61A, 61A n.	Hesiod	50, 50 n., 61A n.
Etruria	26	<i>Shield</i>	45, 45 n.
Euboea	60A n.	Hesychius of Miletus	3A
Eubulides of Miletus	56 n.	Hidreus of Caria	36A, 36A n.
Eucles, son of Astyanactis	60A	Hieron II of Syracuse	62, 62 n.
Eudemus of Rhodes	1A, 1A n., 48 n., 60A, 60A n., 60B, 61A n., 61B n.	Hieron	60A, 60B
Eumenes I of Pergamum	6, 6 n.	Hieronymus of Cardia	56 n., 57A n., 59A n., 62 n., 63 n., 64–6 n., 67 n.
Euphantus of Olynthus	56, 56 n.	Hieronymus of Egypt	61A n.
Euripides	9, 28, 28 n., 33, 33 n., 34, 42A, 42A n., 42B, 44A n., 53A n.	Hieronymus of Rhodes	passim
Eustathius	46B n.	<i>Heliaca</i>	8A, 60A, 60B, 60B n.
		<i>Historical Notes</i>	8A, 33, 34, 43A n., 52 n., 59B n.
Gallio, Lucius Annaeus Novatus	27 n.	<i>Letters</i>	8A, 30, 30 n.
Galloi	5 n.	<i>Miscellaneous Notes</i>	8A, 9 n., 47, 49, 59B n.
Gaugamela	59C n.	<i>On Citharodes</i>	8A, 41, 50 n.

<i>On Drunkenness</i>	4 n., 8A, 28, 28 n., 29	Melanippus of Acragas	35
<i>On Poets</i>	8A, 41, 50 n., 52 n., 61A n.	Menaechmus of Sicyon	41, 41 n.
<i>On Suspension</i>	8A, 25 n., 54, 54 n., 55 n.	Meneclis of Alabanda	1A
<i>On Tragedians</i>	8A, 42A, 52 n.	Menedemus of Eretria	55
Hipparchus of Athens	8A, 35 n.	Menelaos	28
Hippobotus	55, 55 n.	Menexenus, son of Socrates	53A
Hipponactean	37A, 37A n.	Methymna	29
Hipponax	37A n.	Metis	61A, 61A n.
Homer	29, 44A, 45 n., 50, 50 n., 61A n., 61B	Metrodorus of Lampsacus	40
Horace	21 n.	Mimnermus of Smyrna	21, 21 n.
Iamblichus	15 n.	Minicius Fundanus, Gaius	25 n.
Ion of Chios	34, 34 n.	Mithraism	61A n.
Iphitus of Elis	41	Moschion	62, 62 n.
Isocrates	37A, 37B, 38A, 38A n., 38B, 38B n., 39 n.	Muses	9, 9 n.
Issus	59C, 59C n.	Myron of Priene	60A, 60B
Karneia: see Carneia		Myrto, daughter of Aristides	53A, 53A n., 53B, 53C
Kronos	44A, 44A n.	Naucrates of Erythrae	37B
Lacedaemonia: see Sparta		Naxos	60A n.
Lamprias	10, 10 n.	Neanthes of Cyzicus	35, 35 n., 52
Lamprocles, son of Socrates	53A	Neoptolemus	43C, 43C n.
Lasthenia of Mantinea	55 n.	Necessity	61A, 61A n.
Leonides of Rhodes	1A	Nicias	36A, 36A n., 36B n., 36C n.
Leonymus of Croton	43C, 43C n.	Nicomedes	51
Licinius Lucullus, Lucius	13A n.	Nicomedes of Acanthus	63, 63 n.
<i>Lindian Chronicle</i>	59B n., 60A n., 60B n.	Night	61B n.
Lindos	59B n., 60A, 60A n.	Ocean	61B, 61C n.
Lucullus: see Licinius		Oeta, Mt.	44A, 44A n., 44B
Lyceum	1A n., 3A n., 4 n., 10 n., 11 n., 37A n.	Olympias of Macedon	30
Lyciscus	3A	Olympics	41, 53C
Lyco of Troas	3A, 3A n., 4 n., 6, 6 n., 12 n., 29 n.	Oreithuia	34 n.
Lycurgus	41, 41 n.	Orpheus	50 n., 61A, 61B, 61B n.
Lysimachus of Athens	53C	Orphics	50 n., 51 n., 61A, 61A n., 61B n.
Manlius Torquatus, Lucius	18A n.	Ouranos: see Sky	
Marathon	60A n.	Pan	57A, 57B, 61A, 61A n.
Mardonius	60A, 60A n., 60B n.	Panaetius of Rhodes	1A, 53B, 53C
Marsyas of Pella	63, 63 n.	Panathenaea	59A n., 59B n.
Mausolus of Halicarnassus	36A n.	Parmenio	29, 29 n.
		Parmenio of Macedon	59C
		Patara	59B, 59B n.
		Patrocles of Thurii	44A, 44B, 44B n.
		Pausanias the Heraclitist	51
		Peisander of Camira	1A
		Peistratids	35
		Pella	56 n., 57A n.

Peloponnesian War	63	Protagonos	61A, 61A n.
Peraea	1 n., 2 n.	Prytaneum	53C
Perdiccas II of Macedon	63, 63 n.	Prytanis the Peripatetic	3A, 9
Pericles	31, 31 n., 49, 63	Pupius Piso, Marcus	11 n., 14 n., 16D n.
Persaeus of Citium	4 n., 56 n., 57A, 57A n., 57B	Pyrrho of Elis	4 n., 16A, 16B, 20B, 20B n.
Phaedo of Elis	54, 54 n.	Pythia: <i>see</i> Delphi	
Phainias of Eresus	35 n.	Pythian: <i>see</i> Delphi	
Phalaris	17 n., 35, 35 n.	Pythagoras of Samos	50, 50 n.
Phanes	61A, 61A n., 61C, 61C n.	Pythagoreans	35 n., 43C n., 50 n., 51 n.
Pherecydes of Syros	61A n.		
Phila of Elis	4	Rhodes	1A, 1A n., 2 n., 3A n., 4 n., 58 n., 59A n., 59C, 59C n., 60A, 60A n.
Philip II of Macedon	30, 30 n., 33 n.	Rhodiacs	29 n.
Philochorus of Athens	43C n., 44A, 63, 63 n.	Rhoetus	43C
Philodemus of Gadara	25 n., 38A n., 38B n., 44A n., 56 n.	Rufinus the grammarian	37B n.
Philonicus	38B, 38B n.		
Philoniscus	38B n.	Salamis (Cyprus)	59A
Phintias of Syracuse	35 n.	Samos	60A n.
Phoenix	42A n., 42B	Sappho of Lesbos	41
Phormio the Peripatetic	3A	Saturn	44A n., 44B
Phlya	28, 28 n.	Satyrus	49 n., 52 n., 53A, 53A n., 53B, 53B n.
Pindar	34 n., 44A n.	Scythians	7, 7 n., 29, 29 n.
Piso: <i>see</i> Pupius Piso, Marcus		Scythinus of Teos	51, 51 n.
Plato	9, 9 n., 10 n., 12 n., 13A n., 15, 22, 38B n., 43B n., 43C, 43C n., 54 n., 61A n., 63, 63 n.	Seleucus of Alexandria	29, 29 n.
Plutarch	9 n., 10 n., 23 n., 25 n., 26 n., 32 n., 36A n., 36B n., 36C n., 40 n., 44B, 44B n., 53C n., 59C n.	Seneca, Lucius Annaeus	27 n.
Pluto	58	Sicily	35, 44A, 44A n., 44B
Polemo of Athens	13A, 13A n., 16B, 17, 32 n., 54 n., 57A n.	Simmius of Rhodes	1A
Polus of Acragas	63 n.	Simylinos of Tlos	2, 2 n.
Polyclitus of Thessaly	62, 62 n.	Sky	61B, 61C
Polycrates of Samos	35, 35 n.	Socrates	13A, 22, 43C, 53A, 53A n., 53B, 53B n., 53C, 53C n., 54, 63 n.
Polycrite, daughter of Lysimachus	53C	Socratics	12 n., 54 n.
Polydeuces	44A	Sosius Senecio, Quintus	9 n.
Polyzelus of Rhodes	60A, 60B	Sophocles	32, 33, 34, 34 n., 43A, 43A n., 43B, 43C
Pompeii	59C n.	Sophocles the younger	44A
Porphyrio, Pomponius	21 n.	Sophoniscus, son of Socrates	53A
Poseidon	44A, 44A n.	Sosibius of Laconia	41, 41 n.
Posidonius of Apamea	1A, 25 n., 43B n.	Sotion of Alexandria	49 n.
Praxiphanes of Mytilene	1A, 3A	Sparta	35 n., 36A n., 41 n., 44A, 44B, 53B n.
Praxiteles	3A	Speusippus of Athens	9, 13A n., 17, 55
Priam	46B	Sphaerus	51
Proclus	61A n.	Stobaeus	31

276 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

Stoics	12 n., 13A, 13A n., 14 n., 15, 15 n., 16A, 16B n., 16C n., 16D n., 17 n., 20B n., 23 n., 25 n., 26 n., 27 n., 44A n., 56 n.	Theopompus of Chios	63, 63 n.
Strabo	1A n.	Thera	28 n.
Strato of Lampsacus	3A, 11, 30 n., 43C n.	Theraici	28
Stratocles of Rhodes	1A	Thessaly	65
Suda	39 n., 42A n., 42B n., 52 n.	Thrasymachus of Chalcedon	37B
Sun: <i>see</i> Helios		Timachidas of Rhodes	60A n.
Syrianus	61A n.	Timaeus of Tauromenium	62, 62 n.
Tenos	44A, 44A n.	Time	61A, 61A n., 61B
Terpander of Lesbos	41, 41 n.	Timocritus	60A, 60B
Tertullian	43C n.	Timon of Phlius	4 n., 5, 5 n., 7, 7 n.
Tethys	61B, 61C n.	Tithonus	46A, 46A n., 46B, 46B n.
Thales of Miletus	47, 47n., 48, 48 n.	Tlos	2, 2 n.
Thargelia	28, 28 n.	Torquatus: <i>see</i> Manlius Torquatus, Lucius	
Thasos	60A n.	Trajan	36C n.
Thebes	35, 35 n.	Troy	43C, 59B n.
Theodectes of Phaselis	37B	Tyre	59C n.
Theodorus of Byzantium	37B	Xanthippe	53A, 53B
Theodote of Elis	4	Xenagoras	60A
Theon of Alexandria	57A n.	Xenocrates of Chalcedon	13A n., 16C, 17
Theon of Phocis	40 n.	Xenophon	9, 9 n., 36A n., 40, 43B n.
Theophilus	59C	Xerxes	52
Theophrastus of Eresus	3A, 5 n., 9 n., 11, 11 n., 13A n., 14, 17, 28, 28 n., 30, 30 n., 36A n., 37B, 40	Zeno of Citium	4 n., 13A, 14 n., 16B, 20B, 23, 23 n., 56, 56 n., 57A n.
		Zeno of Elea	52
		Zeno of Tarsus	24 n.
		Zenobius	42C n., 59B n.
		Zeus	12, 61A, 61A n.

3

The Life of Lyco and the Life of the Lyceum

Jørgen Mejer

Diogenes Laertius' Lives of Strato and Lyco in Book 5 are very short and their major contributions to Peripatetic biography are the two philosophers' last wills which seem to derive from Lyco's successor Aristo (cf. D.L. 5.64). In addition to Aristo, Diogenes refers to Apollodorus in the former Life, and to Hermippus and Antigonos of Carystus in his Life of Lyco; he offers information about Lyco's dates in a way that seems to indicate that Lyco also appeared in Apollodorus' *Chronica*. In both Lives we have lists of homonyms but we do not know the source. In the Life of Strato Diogenes has a list of books, but not in his Life of Lyco despite the fact that he knows from Lyco's last will that he did publish books. The contrast to the other Peripatetic Lives in Diogenes is remarkable,¹ but we cannot determine whether this lack of information is due to the fact that there was little information to be found or to the fact that these two philosophers just did not attract much attention

¹ In the Life of Demetrius we have references to Hermippus, Didymus, Heraclides Lembus/Sotion, Demetrius Magnes and Favorinus as sources, and we have a bibliography and a list of homonyms, while in the Life of Heraclides Ponticus there are references to Aristoxenus, Chamaeleon, Sotion, Hermippus, and Demetrius Magnes, and a bibliography and list of homonyms.

in later times.² We do not know why Diogenes ends his Peripatetic succession with Lyco, much earlier than the Academic succession. Even if he had his information from Lyco's successor Aristo, there must have been some information about later Peripatetics like Critolaus in his sources.

Despite the paucity of his sources, we can learn some important pieces of biographical information about Lyco from Diogenes' *Life* (5.65–74 = **1**), especially when we compare both the information about his life and his last will with what we know about his predecessors.

Most important, Lyco seems to have had a large group of associates around him when he wrote his last will: Lyco mentions ten associates active in his school, the same number as Theophrastus mentions in his last will (D.L. 5.53), and more than Strato (who mentions nine, D.L. 5.62 = **4**). In addition to these, two other persons are requested to help the main executor Lyco, and one further person is mentioned as a witness to his will, but whether they were active members of the school is unclear. Furthermore, Lyco owned at least sixteen slaves and servants, whereas Strato only mentions five and Theophrastus twelve, and Lyco donated all together twenty minae and substantial property (land in the Troad, Athens, and Aegina, numerous personal belongings) to his heirs, while Strato only donated one mina (plus an unspecified amount); Theophrastus, on the other hand, donated 110 minae to various people. The conclusion must be that while Theophrastus unquestionably must have been a wealthy man, nothing indicates that Lyco was less successful than Strato. The fact that he, in contrast to Strato (**4**), left his school to a group of associates seems to indicate that he was not terribly worried about its continued activity. Lyco's confidence in his associates' ability to carry on the philosophical activities ("The Peripatos I leave to those of the members who wish to make use of it. . . . They are to elect as their leader whoever in their view is likely to continue to attend to the business of the school, and will be most capable of keeping

² Nor for that matter did any other Peripatetic after Strato; they do not seem to have been part of the general biographical tradition. Apart from (possibly) Antigonus of Carystus there is no evidence that anybody wrote a biography of Lyco or of any other of the later Peripatetics. We know that Lyco's successor Aristo collected the last wills of his predecessors, but whether he did so in a biographical context is difficult to say. Only fragments dealing with Heraclitus (and incidentally Socrates) and Epicurus have been transmitted, fr. 28–32 W. The limited scope of the fragments is not commented upon by the most recent study of Aristo, Gigante (1996).

it together”) is in sharp contrast to Strato’s somewhat despondent provision in his last will: “I leave the seminar to Lyco, since of the rest some are too old and others too busy” (4.12–13).³

That the school of Aristotle was alive and lively under Lyco is also evident from Antigonus of Carystus’ somewhat biased description of the symposia in the Peripatos in this period (8). What this text tells us is that there were many guests, including older members of the Peripatos, participating in the school dinners, so many that the contributions collected from the members of the school were insufficient to cover all the costs. Hence, some people were reluctant to join the school because they had to be responsible for the administration of the school for a month (including being responsible for the behavior of the students) and cover the expenses for the meal(s), even though many more participated than those who contributed. In addition to the meal(s) proper, the administrator was also responsible for the sacrifices and the entertainment.⁴

These are the facts; whether these social occasions were an example of “luxuriousness and outward pomp” is another matter. It is likely simply to express Antigonus’ negative attitude towards the Peripatos.

³ Strato’s statement does not imply that Lyco was less qualified than other members of the school; the end of Strato’s last will shows that he had confidence in Lyco.

⁴ The statement “Now, all this was obviously foreign to dialectic and philosophy, and more at home with luxuriousness and outward pomp” seems to be Antigonus’ summary of the reprehensible features of the Peripatos. If so, it is unlikely that the statement immediately before it should mean “besides, (one was obliged) to offer a sacrifice and to act as overseer of the rites in honor of the Muses” as seems to be the general interpretation since Wilamowitz. The whole period beginning with ἔδει is supposed to explain why some people were reluctant to become members of the Peripatos, hence the final indirect statement, also governed by ἔδει, must have a negative implication: it is a burden for the administrator. To translate the text as meaning that he was in charge of the (worship of the) Muses seems not to fit the context. Since sacrifices consisted of meat, they could be expensive—and so would being responsible for entertainment. The manuscript of Athenaeus has Μουσῶν; there is no need to emend to Μουσείων, as some want (e.g. Kaibel, Dorandi). Μοῦσαι simply means “music, song, artistic expressions,” hence “entertainment.” Even if the meaning “overseer of the rites in honor of the Muses” is retained, the train of thought must be negative: both sacrifices and worship of the muses require financial resources.

When Wilamowitz (1881) 264 in his interpretation of 8 finds that it implies the existence of three different officials in the Peripatos, he has let his eagerness to prove his theory of philosophical schools as being “religious associations” get the better of his linguistic capabilities.

After all, Antigonos can also make fun of the philosopher Menedemus for the opposite reason: that his meals were too frugal.⁵ Moreover, Antigonos condemns *all* the philosophers belonging to the generation after Plato and Speusippus, but Lyco in particular. Now, in fact, a contribution of nine obols per month per member seems to be far from excessive.⁶ Epicurus was accused of spending one mina per day on meals (though we have no idea how many people participated in the meals), a scandalous sum according to his critic Timocrates (D.L. 10.6–7).⁷ It is probably no coincidence that the symposia provided a convenient target for those who wanted to criticize philosophers, for symposia were private and thus to some extent beyond public control. No doubt this was one of the reasons why the Epicureans were so often attacked.

It is also worth noticing that symposia were important to the school of Aristotle even before Lyco. Criticism of the extravagant lifestyle of Demetrius of Phalerum was expressed by the historian Duris and by Carystius of Pergamum (fr. 34–5 Wehrli = 43A SOD). Strato mentions in his last will immediately after his books all the furniture in the dining hall, the cushions and the drinking cups (D.L. 5.62 = 4.16–17), and perhaps already Theophrastus bequeathed money for symposia.⁸ In the final analysis, Antigonos' testimony may rather be taken as a sign that the life of the Peripatos was once again flourishing under Lyco, than that it was degenerating. Nor is the information about Lyco's dress from Hermippus,⁹ and his athletic constitution from Anti-

⁵ Antigonos fr. 26 Dorandi.

⁶ Unfortunately, there is not much discussion of the financial arrangements of associations and clubs in Athens, not even in the recent book by Jones (1999); on the philosophical schools see especially 227–34. On the payment of fees in the philosophical schools, cf. Mejer (2000) 34–5.

⁷ Though we may be comparing apples with oranges, it should be noticed that the members of the Bendis cult in the fourth century B.C. paid two drachmas to participate in a particular sacrifice, cf. *IG II²* 1361.17–20.

⁸ Theophr. fr. 36 FHS&G; this and other remarks on philosophers' symposia are in Athenaeus 5 186A–D. Already Aristotle wrote *Νόμοι συσσιτικοί* (D.L. 5.26), and Theophrastus wrote a *Περὶ μέθης* (cf. D.L. 5.44), as did Hieronymus (28–9 White). Even Plato was attacked for living extravagantly, cf. Themistius *Or.* 23.285.

⁹ *FGrHist* 1026 F 74. Hermippus also comments on Theophrastus' looks when lecturing in *FGrHist* 1026 F 35 = fr. 12 FHS&G, cf. also fr. 23 FHS&G. Heraclides Ponticus is also said to have used soft clothes in D.L. 5.86 (= fr. 3 Wehrli). Hence, this piece of information about Lyco is not to be separated from the general anti-Peripatetic tendency in Hellenistic biography.

gonus¹⁰ necessarily to be taken as a sign of extravagant living (1.28–34); other philosophers were accused of the way they dressed, and it may be part of a general anti-Peripatetic tendency in Hellenistic biography.

Now, if my interpretation of **8** above is correct, it also supports Lynch's by now famous demolition of Wilamowitz' theory of the philosophical schools as religious associations.¹¹ For while there is no doubt that Lyco was the head of the Peripatos, **8** does not demonstrate that he was in charge of the cult of the Muses. Even if we reject my interpretation of τῶν Μουσῶν and accept the emendation, all the text says is that whoever was in charge of the school for a particular month was also in charge of the cult of the muses. Thus, the Antigonos text offers no basis for assuming that a philosophical school is identical with a religious association.¹²

For an evaluation of the role of the Peripatos in Athens during the period of Lyco's leadership, it is also significant that Lyco, despite being a foreigner, was influential in Athenian public life. He gave a substantial sum of money to the state (5.71), he benefited the city by

¹⁰ Fr. 24 Dorandi. Cf. also Antigonos fr. 23 = **8**. It is not clear why Antigonos mentioned the athletic appearance of Lyco. He was not the only philosopher with such a background. Also the Stoic philosophers Cleanthes and Chrysippus had engaged in athletic activities before turning to philosophy, cf. D.L. 7.168 and 179. "Bronzed complexion" translates ἐμπνής (1.32), which but may also be translated "shining with oil," following the translation of Gigante; the etymology of this word is quite uncertain. The best commentary is by Menagius *ad locum* in Meibom (1692).

¹¹ Lynch (1972) 108–17.

¹² Wilamowitz' flawed interpretation (1881) 264 has had far more influence on scholarship than it deserves: "Man brauchte nur den eingang des fünften buches Athenaeus zu lesen, um zu dieser anschauung [that the schools were organized as religious associations] zu kommen; für den leser der antigonischen viten wird es vollends kaum eines beweises bedürfen, denn am klarsten wird der eranistische charakter der philosophenschulen aus der schilderung vom leben der Peripatetiker, die Antigonos in seinem Lykon gibt . . . Hier lernen wir die beamten der gesellschaft kennen, einen ἱερωτός (oder mehrere) und einen ἐπιμελητής τῶν Μουσῶν, wobei sich ergibt, dass der für jeden thiasos erforderliche cult im Peripatos der der Musen gewesen ist, und ausserdem einen monatlichen vorstand, ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς εὐκοσμίας ein amt, das an die einrichtungen des Demetrios von Phaleron, die in der ephebie dauer hatten, erinnert, diesem fällt ausser der aufsicht über die hörer (die ἐπιχειροῦντες) die ausrichtung des an jedem neumond stattfindenden gemeinsamen males zu, wofür er von jedem schüler (d. a. jedem gliede des thiasos) anderthalb drachmen erhält . . ." It should be noticed that Capelle (1927) on Lyco is entirely based on Wilamowitz's discussion of Antigonos' Life of Lyco.

giving advice (1.26–7), his reputation was so great that his ships¹³ were spared by the enemies (of Athens? 7.5–8), he was a good friend of King Eumenes and King Attalus (1.34–6) who supported him financially, and he was sought after by King Antiochus (1.36–7), to no avail. This makes sense if we assume that Lyco was loyal to the rulers of his homeland and not to its adversaries. Hence, there is nothing to support the often repeated notion that he was a friend of King Antigonus of Macedon;¹⁴ there is some reason to assume that the statement about Lyco's oral style in 1.10–14 comes from King Antigonus rather than Antigonus of Carystus, though the flowery comparison certainly fits the latter better. We do not know whether Lyco went to Macedon nor whether Antigonus studied with Lyco. King Antigonus had good relations with Stoics and Academics, but not necessarily with the Peripatetics, and the statement only makes sense if we assume a personal relationship.¹⁵ On the other hand, Antigonus of Carystus must have been in Athens at the same time as Lyco and knew the philosophical scene.

We do not know what Lyco did to deserve to be honored by the Delphic Amphictiony (6), but this is another sign of his important social standing.¹⁶

The only facts we know about Lyco's philosophical activities are that he was interested in the education of young people,¹⁷ that his oral delivery was excellent,¹⁸ better than the style of his writings, and that the

¹³ Yet another sign that he was a rich man.

¹⁴ Cf. Tarn (1913), ch. 9.

¹⁵ This statement is not included in Dorandi (1999), who refers (lxvi) to Wehrli (1969) 24–5 which offers no reason for attributing it to King Antigonus. Diogenes can refer to one or the other simply by giving the name Antigonus; however, in all other instances Diogenes refers to Antigonus of Carystus as if he is quoting directly.

¹⁶ The Peripatetic Praxiphanes received similar honors on the island of Delos, cf. fr. 4 W, and an otherwise unknown Peripatetic, Epicrates, was honored by Samos for his benevolence towards the state, cf. *IG* XII.6.1 128. On the role of philosophers in the public life of Athens, cf. Habicht (1988) 12–17.

¹⁷ The fact that the same apophthegm about how to deal with boys is also attributed to Plato, Aristotle, and Isocrates (cf. Wehrli [1968] 25 on fr. 22) does not detract from its value as an indication of Lyco's interests. Perhaps Lyco with this statement also intended a tacit correction to Plato whose guardians were characterized by "fear and respect" (*Rep.* 465B1). On this and the other statements attributed to Lyco, see Fortenbaugh in this volume who also gives alternative translations. Notice that also Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Clearchus wrote books on education.

¹⁸ It is time to drop the commonly accepted emendation by Casaubonus (and ac-

content of Lyco's books, at least according to Cicero, was less satisfying than Strato's (11).¹⁹ Lyco's concern for providing oil for young men in his last will is of course another sign of his interest in education.²⁰ And it is important to notice that several of the statements attributed to Lyco both in Diogenes' *Life* and in the gnomological tradition fit within an educational framework (1, 16, 17, 19, 20). This is not much to base any further conclusions on, but it must be remembered that the Athenian ephebes in the second century BC attended lectures in both the Lyceum and the Academy.²¹ In general, we must not forget that the philosophical activities of all the schools mainly took place in the gymnasium or other public spaces: when the Academic Crantor taught in the Precinct of Asclepius for a while due to his illness, many students came to him there because they believed that he was starting a new school (D.L. 4.24); Carneades was told by the gymnasiarch to lower his voice so that he would not bother others (D.L. 4.63). Nor should we forget that none of the gymnasia were limited to the members of any particular school: the Stoic Chrysippus lectured in the Lyceum (as well as in the Odeum), the Academic Clitomachus in the Palladium, the Stoic (?) Zenodotus both in the Ptolemaeum and in the Lyceum.²² That the philosophical schools played an important role in the life of Athens around 200 BC is attested by Heraclides of Crete in his description of Athens: "Three gymnasia: the Academy, the Lyceum and the Cynosarges, all full of trees and lawns. All sorts of celebrations, intellectual deceptions

cepted by Marcovich) in 1.6. The manuscripts read *περιγεγώνος* and the emendation *περιγεγωνός* (= sonorous?) is an otherwise unknown word that can only be supported by the use of *γεγωνός* in Eusthatus *In Iliadem* 925.51 (3.455 van der Valk). Though the emendation is slight, I fail to see why it is better to propose an unknown word instead of preserving the transmitted word with an unusual meaning. "Locuples" in Cicero 11 may as well express either Greek term. Cf. Fortenbaugh in this volume.

¹⁹ It should, however, not be overlooked that Cicero's judgment is part of a diatribe against the later Peripatetics in a passage in which he tries to demonstrate that these philosophers were not "true" Peripatetics (*De fin.* 5.13). The source is likely to be Antiochus, who was anything but impartial in his view of the history of the school.

²⁰ It is true that we know nothing about physical exercise in the other philosophical schools, but it was an important element in Plato's ideal state, cf. *Rep.* 498B. Hence there is no reason to consider Lyco's provision a sign of lagging interest in philosophy, as does Capelle (1927) 2305.

²¹ See the relevant ephebic inscriptions in Pélékidis (1962) 266. We do not know when this practice began, but it is an indication that the Peripatos was not considered less important than the Academy from the mid-third century BC.

²² D.L. 7.184–5; Philodemus *Acad. Hist.* col. 24–5 Dorandi; *IG* II² 1006.19f.

and entertainment by all sorts of philosophers, many lectures and frequent displays.”²³ It is hard to see how the philosophical schools—except perhaps the Epicureans—could avoid being in the eye of the Athenian public.

The decline of the Peripatetic school was codified by Wilamowitz’s famous remark “was wissen wir denn von Lykon? Dass unter seinem langen scholarchate der Peripatos vollständig heruntergekommen ist, dass mit ihm der zweijahundert lange totenschlaf der aristotelischen philosophie beginnt.”²⁴ If by “totenschlaf” Wilamowitz meant that the intellectual capabilities of the Peripatetic philosophers diminished, then it must be pointed out that this decline seems to have started already during the first two generations after Aristotle’s death.²⁵ The anecdote about Lyco and Aristo, even if it hints at Lyco’s less satisfying intellectual efforts, also confirms an active atmosphere in the school (7). And even if we know nothing about Lyco’s literary output, other Peripatetics of his and later generations continued to publish, though they mainly were concerned with ethical, rhetorical, literary, and biographical matters.²⁶ Cicero seems to have read many of their books; his contemporary, the rhetorician Gorgias, must have read at least one of Lyco’s treatises.²⁷ We do not know why Lyco’s books disappeared almost without a trace, but his provision concerning his books in his last will is certainly unusual. Books by Aristo and Hieronymus were read by Plutarch and Athenaeus. The lack of references and fragments of the Hellenistic Peripatetics may well be a result of the history of the study of Aris-

²³ Fr. 1 Pfister. The text used in Lynch (1972) 156 is deficient. The recent excavation of the Lyceum seems not to have yielded any significant information about the building complex in the pre-Sullan period, at least according to the report in the newspaper *Kathimerini*, Jan. 27, 1997 p. 29.

²⁴ Wilamowitz (1881) 83.

²⁵ As pointed out by Brink (1940) 932–3. Lynch (1972) 135–62 also lays out the evidence for another view of the development of the Peripatetic school, even though he also tends to emphasize the lack of philosophical originality in the Hellenistic Peripatos.

²⁶ The evidence is most easily found in Wehrli’s *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Since Lyco left both published and unpublished books to his heirs (so that the latter may be published), there is no ground for supposing that his literary output was negligible. There is no obvious explanation why Lyco left his published book to a former slave, and his unpublished manuscripts to his associate Callinus (1.105–8). One may compare the story about how Arcesilaus dealt with the hypomnemata of Crantor in D.L. 4.24 and 32, and in Philodemus *Acad. Hist.* col. 18.34–40 Dorandi.

²⁷ Cf. Fortenbaugh in this volume.

totelian texts: if authors did not deal with topics that were relevant for the study of Aristotle, they were no longer read. A large part of the fragments of first-generation Peripatetics like Theophrastus and Strato have been preserved by the Aristotelian commentators.

If by “totenschlaf” Wilamowitz meant that the activities of the Peripatos diminished from the time of Lyco, I hope that it has become clear that there is little evidence that there were fewer members of the Peripatos during this period when both Lyco and Hieronymus of Rhodes were active in Athens. In fact, Strato’s last will seems to indicate that the Peripatos was not flourishing earlier, and Lyco’s concentration on education may well have been an attempt, and successful at that, to revive the school. At least on three occasions after the death of Lyco Peripatetic philosophers did help in political affairs. A few years after Lyco’s death, Prytanis—an outstanding member of the Peripatos, as Polybius calls him—was asked by King Antigonos Doson to write new laws for the city of Megalopolis when it was being rebuilt.²⁸ On another occasion Prytanis was asked by the Athenians to undertake a difficult political mission to the same king.²⁹ And in 156/5 the Athenians sent a diplomatic embassy to Rome consisting of three philosophers, one each from the Academic, Peripatetic, and Stoic schools; this seems to indicate that the Athenians did not consider the Peripatos any less important than the other two schools.³⁰

Andronicus’ work on the *Corpus Aristotelicum* meant a revival of the study of Aristotelian texts, but it should not be overlooked that there were several other Peripatetics (who may be little more than names to us) active as late as the first century BC, some even before Andronicus: Staseas,³¹ Apellicon, Athenion, Demetrius, Xenarchus,

²⁸ Polybius 5.93.8.

²⁹ Cf. *Hesperia* 4 (1935) 525–9, Kassel (1985) 23–4, and Korhonen (1997) 51–2; Korhonen has a very useful discussion of philosophers as ambassadors (40–54) but does not mention Lyco’s role as advisor to the Athenians in 1.26–7.

³⁰ The evidence is collected and discussed in Lynch (1972) 133–4 and 156–8, by Mette (1985) 66–70, and in Korhonen (1997) 40–2. Note that no Epicurean philosopher participated even though we know that the school was in good shape in the second century BC. Critolaus was, like Lyco, a good rhetorician; the evidence is in Lynch (1972) 159. Critolaus was honored with a statue in Olympia but we do not know why; see *BCH* 79 (1955) 247.

³¹ We do not know whether Staseas was active in Athens, but his philosophical activity must have attracted the attention of M. Pupius Piso, in whose house he lived for a long time (Cicero *De or.* 1.104); Cicero certainly considered Piso an informed representative of the Peripatos before the publications of the *Corpus Aristotelicum*.

Cratippus,³² and the younger Aristo; indeed, if the latter two left Plato's school and switched to become Peripatetics,³³ it must have been because Aristotle's school still was worth the trouble. The fact that there was a Peripatetic audience, and one that must have wanted to read Aristotle's own texts, in the first century BC, will also explain why there apparently was such an effort to edit the *Corpus Aristotelicum*. The *Corpus Aristotelicum* was certainly not meant to be read by the general public. It is worth noticing that the revival of Aristotelian studies apparently antedated Thrasyllus' work on the *Corpus Platonium* by a century. There is little reason to assume that the Peripatos suffered a worse decline than the other philosophical schools in Athens during the Hellenistic period.

Works Cited

- Brink, K. O. 1940. "Peripatos," *RE Suppl.* 7: 899–949.
 Capelle, W. 1927. "Lykon 14," *RE* 13: 2303–8
 Dorandi, T., ed. 1999. *Antigone de Caryste* (Paris: Budé).
 Dorandi, T., ed. 1991. *Filodemo Storia dei filosofi [.] Platone e l'accademia* (Naples: Bibliopolis).
 Gigante, M. 1996. "Aristone di Ceo biografo dei filosofi," *Studi classici e orientali* 46.1: 17–23.
 Habicht, Chr. 1988. *Hellenistic Athens and her Philosophers*, David Magie Lecture 1988 (Princeton: Program in the History, Archaeology, and Religions of the Ancient World); reprinted in Habicht, *Athen in hellenistischer Zeit* (Munich 1994: Beck).

On Roman students of philosophy in Athens in the first century BC, see Lynch (1972) 159–60.

³² Cratippus was teaching in Mytilene at least between 51 and 46 (Cicero *Timaeus* 1 and *Brutus* 250), but then came to Athens. Whether he was teaching as a member of the Peripatos or privately, he must have impressed his contemporaries so much that Cicero asked Caesar to make him a Roman citizen and the City Council of Athens to ask Cratippus to continue his philosophical teaching in the city (Plutarch *Cicero* 24). In fact, even though Cicero decries the state of philosophy in Athens in general, he never indicates that the Peripatos was less important than any other school.

³³ Cf. Philodemus *Acad. Hist.* col. 35.8–15.

- Jones, N. F. 1999. *The Associations of Classical Athens: The Response to Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University).
- Kassel, R. 1985. "Der Peripatetiker Prytanis," *ZPE* 60: 23–4.
- Korhonen, T. 1997. "Self-Concept and Public Image of Philosophers and Philosophical Schools at the Beginning of the Hellenistic Period," *Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens* 6.
- Lynch, J. P. 1972. *Aristotle's School, A Study of a Greek Educational Institution* (Berkeley: University of California).
- Meibom, M. 1692. *Diogenis Laertii De vitis, dogmatibus et apophthegmatis clarorum philosophorum libri X* (Amsterdam: H. Westenius).
- Mejer, J. 2000. *Die Überlieferung der Philosophie im Altertum*, Royal Danish Academy of Sciences, Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser 80 (Copenhagen).
- Mette, H. J. 1985. "Weitere Akademiker heute: von Lakydes bis zu Kleitomachos," *Lustrum* 27: 66–70.
- Pélékidis, Chr. 1962. *Historie de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ* (Paris: Bocard).
- Tarn, W. W. 1913. *Antigonos Gonatas* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Wehrli, F. 1968. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 6: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (2nd ed: Basel: Schwabe).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1881. *Antigonos von Karystos = Philologische Untersuchungen* 4 (Berlin).

4

Hieronymus in Athens and Rhodes

Elisabetta Matelli

We have no βίος of Hieronymus and little information about him. But Stephen White's new collection of evidence, which adds some material omitted or overlooked by Wehrli, invites a reassessment from fresh perspectives. The life and work of a figure consigned by history to obscurity must be pieced together from faint traces, and for Hieronymus we must rely on hypotheses based on probable—even if unprovable—interpretation. I shall try to show that the available evidence supports some new conclusions and challenges some prevailing views about Hieronymus. It also casts new light on the Hellenistic Peripatos.

The Gravestone of Hieronymus, Son of Simylinus of Tlos

I start at the end with the funerary inscription uncovered on Rhodes, which Wehrli excluded but White now includes as text **2**.¹ I shall not

¹ First published by Hiller and Robert (1902); purchased by Hiller in Alexandria where it had been brought from Rhodian Trianta. See also de Waele (1927) 98–9, Nilsson (1950) 222–3 and Taf. 4.1, Curtius (1951) 20–32 and Taf. 8, Arrighetti (1954), Bieber (1961) 127 and fig. 490, Fraser (1977) 34–6, Pfuhl and Möbius (1977–9) 500–1 (with bibliography) and Taf. 300 no. 2085, Scholl (1994) 247–9, Mygind (1999) 255 no. 8.

reopen the debate over its dating and attribution. There are good grounds for assigning it to Hieronymus the Peripatetic. One important factor is its resemblance to another inscription, which is securely dated to the end of the third century and dedicated to the philosopher Arideices of Rhodes, a pupil of the Academic Arcesilaus (who may have been Arideices' uncle).² The dating of inscriptions from this period is complex and difficult. But a marked similarity in the lettering on these two stones supports the hypothesis that the Hieronymus relief is not simply a later imitation of earlier styles.³ Its elegant and regular lettering is striking (see p. 476). Straight lines are unbroken and widened slightly at the apices, which suits a style first found in the latter half of the third century; but they lack the sharp serifs that are common later.⁴ This is a work of art, and instead of adopting new lettering styles, it seems to retain the regularity of the classical period deliberately, as do similar examples of conservatism found on Rhodes in the third century.⁵ The latter half of this century is very likely when Hieronymus the Peripatetic died.

The inscription and relief provide important information about the man it commemorates. The stone was found on Rhodes at the entrance to a sepulchral monument at Ialysos (modern Trianta).⁶ An inscription above the relief names the deceased fully: $\text{IEP}\Omega\text{NYMOY TOY}\Sigma\text{IMYAINOY TA}\Omega\text{IOY}$. The patronym and demotic establish that the family was Rhodian. Another inscription below the relief identifies the artist only by name: $\Delta\text{AMATPIOS E}\Pi\text{OIHSE}$. The elegant script and the

² So Hiller (1912) 229–39 (*GVI* 1451) and (1942) 163; cf. Boyancé (1937) 278–84. On Arideices, see Dorandi (1987) 122; cf. n. 40 below.

³ Fraser (1977) 129–30 n. 203 rightly observes that Hiller overstates the similarities between the two inscriptions. Here I emphasize only the similar lettering.

⁴ See the dating criteria in Guarducci (1995) 368–90. The lettering resembles the simplicity of classical styles but shows Hellenistic traits of enlarged lines and a shorter medial bar in the epsilon. The artist's signature also appears to follow the Hellenistic style of a smaller omicron.

⁵ In addition to the Arideices inscription, compare *ILind* 647, which is of lesser quality but has the same regularity of letters; Blinkenberg (1941) 963 assigns it securely to the third century: "caractères réguliers du 3e s. A., s'élargissant vers les extrémités, mais dépourvus d'apices." A third-century date for the Hieronymus inscription is accepted by Pfuhl and Möbius (1977–9) 501, Fraser (1977) 36, Gaiser (1980) 15.

⁶ The measurements furnished by Hiller and Robert (1902) 121 are 1.005 m. wide, 0.31 m. high, 0.09 m. deep. New measurements are provided by P. Scholz in this volume.

high quality of the relief indicate that this Hieronymus was a person of stature.

The relief between the two inscriptions is impressive not only for its skilled craftsmanship but also for the originality and complexity of its iconography. A thorough discussion is impossible here. I present only my conclusions, which are based on autopsy of the stone in the Altes Museum of Berlin (SK 1888) and a critical review of previous discussions. While the lettering of the inscription typifies classical forms, the relief evokes Hellenistic styles of the third century.⁷ It is divided into two main sections: the scene on the left shows that the deceased spent much time in a school, and the scene on the right shows that he had special interests in the afterlife.

1. On the left is a scene with five figures which is usually interpreted as a discussion in a philosophical school (see p. 477).⁸ At the left edge there is visible a single leg of a figure who was probably seated. We cannot tell if this figure was originally completed on an adjacent stone. The stone may have been the gable of a door;⁹ there are signs of connections to other stones at each side;¹⁰ and incomplete figures are improbable. A second man wearing a long chiton and mantle has an open scroll on his lap.¹¹ He faces three interlocutors, each wearing a

⁷ Pfuhl and Möbius (1977–9) 501.

⁸ This interpretation was proposed by the first editors, Hiller and Robert (1902) 127–9, and followed by Fraser 35 (1977), Scholl (1994) 247. Nilsson (1950) 235 claims the philosophers' discussion "kann nicht der Oberwelt angehören." Curtius (1951) 20–1, comparing two mosaics from Torre Annunziata and Villa Albani (now in the Museo Nazionale in Naples) which depict "Philosophengesprächs," argues that the figures are not philosophers but "wise men" conversing in Elysium. Gaiser (1980) 15–17 dismisses this view on the basis of a different interpretation of the same mosaics. Arrighetti (1954) 127 denies that this Hieronymus was a "philosopher"; cf. Bieber (1961) 127: "the tomb relief of a Rhodian schoolmaster, perhaps a member of one of the celebrated schools of rhetors." I see no signs of a family farewell, as Scholz does.

⁹ Pfuhl and Möbius (1977–9) 500: "Oben nach rechts und links je eine Klammerbettung, seitlich kleine Bossen zur Verzahnung mit den Nachbarsteinen. Wahrscheinlich von der Tür eines Grabtemenos oder einer Grabkammer." Cf. Hiller and Robert (1902) 121–7.

¹⁰ Hiller and Robert (1902) 122, Pfuhl and Möbius (1977–9) 500.

¹¹ All previous scholars identify this figure with Hieronymus; see Hiller and Robert (1902) 127–8: "die Hauptfigur ist offenbar der fast ganz in Vorderansicht gestellte bärtige Mann links, der, eine offene Rolle im Schoß, aus ihr vorzulesen oder das Gelesene zu interpretieren scheint"; Fraser (1977) 35: "the main figure is clearly the complete figure seated to the left, facing outwards and reading from a scroll"; cf. Gaiser (1980) 16. Scholz (in this volume) proposes that Hieronymus is the other seated man

himation: a young boy, standing and bare-chested;¹² a seated man; and a third man, apparently middle-aged, standing behind the second and resting his right arm on his shoulder. The seated listener in this group is bearded and appears older than the other listeners; he holds a walking stick in his right hand and leans toward the speaker. His posture suggests importance, and he seems to be a colleague rather than a pupil.

2. A wall separates this scene from the next, and one has a clear sense of passing from the world of the living to the realm of the dead. First, Hermes (identified by his winged feet) and Persephone stand beside Pluto, who is seated on a great throne, facing left and holding a scepter (see p. 478). Hermes has no caduceus; his left hand instead holds what may be either the rolled hem of his mantle or a rod like one held (also in the left hand) by a winged figure in a scene further to the right.¹³ To their right behind Pluto stands a man wrapped in a mantle from the waist down, and leaning to his left on a walking stick (see p. 479). Interpretations vary here and I find none fully convincing.¹⁴ The figure looks to the right toward a scene of the afterlife: first, two figures seated in a garden in serene and thoughtful postures; then behind the right figure, a tree, which may be a symbol of Elysium. I speak vaguely of “figures” because neither their identity nor their gender is certain. Some see “a young man and a woman sitting on blocks of natural rock beneath a tree.”¹⁵ But I find similarities in physique, clothing, and posture between the second figure (the “woman”) and the man identified as

who leans forward; but then the deceased would be listening rather than teaching, and he would turn his shoulders to the underworld, which dominates the iconography of the relief, probably because of the deceased’s previous interest in the underworld.

¹² He wears a “*himation* porté en jupe”; see Losfeld (1991) 135–49 on the different ways of wearing the *himation*.

¹³ Hiller and Robert 129 (1902): “Einige Betrachter wollten auch in seiner Linken einen geflügelten Petasos erkennen; doch scheint uns das nicht sicher, da das um die Hand geschlungene Gewand auch bei dem Mädchen mit den Schmetterlingsflügeln weiter rechts ganz ähnlich behandelt ist.”

¹⁴ Some identify him with Hieronymus in the underworld: Hiller and Robert 130–1 (1902), Pfuhl and Möbius (1977–9) 501, Fraser (1977) 35. Curtius (1951) 22–3 rejects Hieronymus and proposes various deities or heroes in the underworld. Xagorai (1994) 627 no. 7 proposes Rhadamanthys.

¹⁵ Fraser 35 (1977). Hiller and Robert (1902) 132 interpret the pair as “Repräsentanten der Dahingeshiedenen, zu denen ja jetzt auch Hieronymos gehört”; cf. Curtius (1951) 23–4, Pfuhl and Möbius 501 (1977–9).

Hieronimus in the first scene: in both cases a strong physique, long chiton, and parted legs. So I suggest that here we see Hieronimus again, now in Hades in the posture of one of the blessed. Let me emphasize the peculiarity of his dress: a long chiton, though common on women, is significant when worn by a man. This luxurious garment was peculiar to certain professions in the Classical and Hellenistic period: “En tant que vêtement professionnel, le chiton long appartient au monde que nous appellerions du spectacle et des courses, celui des musiciens, des acteurs, des conducteurs de char. . . . Vêtement religieux, un chiton long est porté par les prêtres, sans ceinture.”¹⁶ “That the long Ionic chiton with sleeves was worn by men as well as women, is abundantly evident from the monuments. . . . Together with the himation, it probably constituted a sort of state dress for priests and other officials, even after it had been discarded for daily use as being too luxurious.”¹⁷ The long chiton also seems to have been typical of the hierophant, the high priest of Eleusis.¹⁸ So I think it significant that each of these two very similar figures wears both a long chiton (with long sleeves) and a *himation*.¹⁹

3. The last section depicts in higher relief a female figure whose butterfly wings identify her as Psyche (since *ψυχή* can also mean “butterfly”) and who holds a stick or torch (see p. 480).²⁰ She stands behind another seated figure, apparently female, shown in profile, who holds her chin in her right hand and looks to the right; her right elbow rests on her left forearm, which lies horizontally across her knees. My examination of the stone confirms that a piece of cloth hangs from Psyche’s left forearm. This is probably not the border of her *peplos*, since the fabric appears thin and lacks edging; rather, it resembles a veil (“ein kleines Mäntelchen”: Hiller and Robert [1902] 132–3), much like the

¹⁶ Losfeld (1991) 97 and 102–9; cf. Bieber (1928) 20–1.

¹⁷ Abrahams (1908) 69.

¹⁸ Losfeld (1991) 97.

¹⁹ Long sleeves are rare in Greece and suggestive of the East; see Losfeld (1991) 112–18: in the fourth century Alexander “fera des efforts pour inclure les manches dans sa politique d’importation des coutumes perses”; cf. Heuzey (1922) 82–3. The long chiton is also typical of actors: Bieber (1928) 20–1, Navarre (1925) 203.

²⁰ W. Burkert suggests to me this may be a torch; he compares the bas-relief on the Torrenova sarcophagus, which depicts Heracles’ purification by fire: he is seated, his head veiled, and a priestess behind him holds a torch towards the ground; see n. 29 below.

one over the head of another figure at the right end of the stone.²¹ This last figure, also female but only partially preserved, appears to be either sinking into or rising out of the earth.²² Clearly visible is a veil which she holds over her head with her own hands.

This complex imagery has resisted convincing interpretation. Some propose Platonic models for both scenes, both Hieronymus with his students and the underworld.²³ As far as I know, this is the earliest representation of Psyche as a daimon in female clothes with butterfly wings in the context of initiatory rites in the underworld.²⁴ The practice of depicting a soul after death as a butterfly may be much older. Some consider the gold butterflies on jewellery from Mycenaean tombs symbolic;²⁵ and the butterfly was sometimes associated with phallic imagery as a symbol of biological continuity.²⁶ But in this Peripatetic

²¹ The representation of drapery on heads of men and women often appears in the course of an initiatory *anodos*; Bérard (1974) 120–2. See the initiation scene on a hydria at Genoa (Bérard pl. 14 fig. 47), in which a priestess lifts a veil from the head of a neophyte who emerges from the ground or water (scholars agree that the scene is an *anodos* but disagree on whether the neophyte emerges from the ground or water). In initiatory “rites of passage,” a veil is placed on the head as a symbol of the initiate’s death and then removed as a symbol of purification and rebirth; cf. Bérard 121: “dans une phase des Mystères, les mystes devaient avoir le visage couvert. . . . Le dévoilement signifie dépouillement et purification; il sanctionne la nouvelle naissance.” See Freier (1963), based on Latin sources, esp. 170–1, 175–7. On ritual initiation as “death and rebirth,” see Burkert (1987) 99–114.

²² Images of *anabasis* and *katabasis* are often ambiguous; see Bérard (1974) 22–9.

²³ Hiller and Robert (1902) 127–8; Arrighetti (1954) 124. The school scene has been compared to the mosaic of Torre Annunziata; Petersen (1897) 328–9, Gaiser (1980) 8–13 and Taf. 2–3. But the similarity is only in broad terms, not in details, and it may be a standard motif. Nor do I see any strict allusion to the myth of Er in *Rep.* 10.

²⁴ Butterflies appear on funerary monuments after the second century; see Pfuhl and Möbius nos. 507, 650, 746, 1008, 1657, 2037. Pfuhl and Möbius (1977–9) 528 emphasize that “der Schmetterling deutet sicher die Seele an, wenn er von Hermes entführt wird”; see three funerary representations (Imperial Roman) of Hermes Psychopompos leading a butterfly (nos. 360, 1146, 1636).

²⁵ Keller (1913) vol. 2 435–7, fig. 135a–b. E.P.B. (1930) 218–19 cites finds of Arthur Evans: “Sir Arthur had excellent pictures of Minoan and Mycenaean signet rings and gems with religious representations. He considers the butterflies and chrysalids which appear in the corners of these scenes as symbols of future life.” Immisch (1915) 195 and Wiesner (1938) 186 consider the Mycenaean butterflies merely favorite jewels of the deceased.

²⁶ Immisch (1915) 197 relates φάλλαίνα (moth) to φαλλός (phallus; cf. λύκαινα from λύκος and θείαινα from θεός); contra Chantraine (1968) s.v. φάλλαίνα 2, Günter

context, I think it is more significant that Aristotle and Theophrastus are the first to use the term *psyche* to refer to butterflies, and they describe its metamorphosis.²⁷

I would emphasize that the Psyche in the Hieronymus relief is not to be interpreted either as an individual soul or as a judging daimon. Most scholars have followed Robert, who identified this winged figure as Nemesis because her pose resembles descriptions of Nemesis as a judge in two hymns (*Orphic Hymn* 61 and Mesomedes' *Hymn to Nemesis*) and in Timaeus Locrus (87–8).²⁸ But we can accept this interpretation only if Psyche is shown as a judge, which is unlikely here. The rod in her right hand, the veil in her left hand, and the veil covering the head of the other woman (either sinking or rising) more likely signify a daimon supervising a ritual of initiation.²⁹ Hermes, who here holds a similar fabric in his left hand, appears elsewhere as Psychopompus and in passages both to and from the underworld (Siebert nos. 639–45). My reading of the last scene suggests that Psyche is a daimon who supervises not a final judgment but a rite of passage or transformation in the underworld, probably in connection with one of the mystery cults attested on Rhodes.³⁰ Moreover, there is no evidence for cults of Nemesis

(1919) 219. Waser (1909) 3234 cites a sixth-century amphora (Berlin no. 1684) on which a flying butterfly is moistened by drops of sperm; see Davies and Kathirithamby (1986) 99–113. In the Hellenistic era, a female Psyche with putto-like butterfly wings appears in the phallic imagery of some tombs; cf. Pfuhl and Möbius (1977–9) 231–2 no. 893 (second century BCE).

²⁷ Arist. *HA* 5.19 551a13–27, Theophr. *CP* 5.7.3, *HP* 2.4.4; the phrase αἱ λεγόμεναι ψυχαί suggests a popular usage. The earliest attested use of ψυχή for “butterfly” is in Aristotle. Nicander calls the moth φάλλαινα (*Theriaka* 760), which a scholium reports was used as a synonym for ψυχή only on Rhodes; but Immisch (1915) 196 thinks this use of φάλλαινα was originally more widespread. See also Davies and Kathirithamby (1986) 102–3 and 108–9. Wilamowitz (1931) 377: “Die Schmetterlingsfügel der Psyche sind freilich mir wenigstens aus der alten Kunst nicht bekannt, so dass ich sie für hellenistisch halte. Sie hat die Seele erst bekommen, als sie dem Schmetterling ihren Namen gegeben hatte.”

²⁸ Hiller and Robert (1902) 137; this would suit the figure on our relief if she were a judge.

²⁹ A scene of initiation and purification is suggested by similar scenes on the Torrenova sarcophagus (nos. 47 and 49 Bianchi). On the meaning of *velificatio* in mystery rites, see n. 21 above.

³⁰ Especially interesting are a late third-century Rhodian epigram (*IG* XII 1.141 = *GVI* 1451 Peek) and an initiation inscription found in the city of Rhodes (first century or later); see Hiller and Robert (1902) 140–1. Cf. a late Hellenistic funerary monument at Cova/Akandia (now Karakonero): a courtyard cut into the rock and decorated

on Rhodes.³¹ Nor does Psyche here bear any resemblance to the charming putto found on many gravestones already in the second century.³²

This complex set of images is dedicated to an influential Rhodian teacher, whose students included the young, mature adults, and the aged. The considerable space devoted to the scenes of the afterlife points to the teacher's special interest in religion. Other third- or second-century gravestones found on Rhodes have ties to mystery cults, and there is extensive evidence from this period of interest in the afterlife on Rhodes.³³ But this relief stands out for its striking and significant images. Although its precise original location is unknown, it is clearly funerary.³⁴ But if Hieronymus son of Simylinus of Tlos is the Peripatetic philosopher and the relief comes from the entrance to his tomb, then the prevailing view that he lived, taught, and died not on his native Rhodes but in Athens must be reconsidered.

Hieronymus in Athens

It will be useful to review the literary evidence for Hieronymus in its historical context. His good relations with Antigonus II Gonatas are well attested. Friendship with the royal house of Macedonia goes back to the Lyceum's founder, but it was not shared by Lyco, who cultivated ties instead with Eumenes and Attalus of Pergamum (D.L. 5.67 = 1 SFOD). Hieronymus' friendship with the Macedonian King and his hostility toward Lyco—both political and personal—provided two

with life-size figures in a Dionysiac scene; see Guldager Bilde (1999) 227–46. On the mystery cults on Rhodes, see Nilsson (1950) 222–3 and Morelli (1959). Boyancé (1937) 279–80 compares the the Muses in the Rhodian epitaph for Arideices (see n. 2 above) with *Orphic Hymn* 71.4–8 and Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1050–3 (alluding to Eleusinian mysteries). On Hellenistic mystery cults and eastern influences, see Briem (1941) 272–373.

³¹ Morelli (1959) 165 denies there was a cult of Nemesis on Rhodes: “Il culto di Nemesis largamente diffuso, specie in età ellenistica, in tutto il mondo greco, non figura tra i culti rodi”; but he cites an altar-dedication to Nemesis: Ἀντίγονος Νέμεσι κατ' ὄνειρον (*ILind* 644). See also Ἀδραστείας καὶ Νεμέσιος in Kontorini (1983) 63–4.

³² Pfuhl and Möbius nos. 429 (p. 143) and 1031 (p. 288), both second century BCE.

³³ See Nilsson (1950) 223: “Der Unterweltsglaube scheint unter den rhodischen Schulmeistern wirklich stark entwickelt gewesen zu sein. Oder ist es nur Zufall, dass uns gerade von dort Zeugnisse bewahrt sind?” See n. 34 above.

³⁴ This is the consensus: Hiller and Robert (1902), Pfuhl and Möbius (1977–9) 500, Fraser (1977) 34–5.

strong motives for him to leave Athens and return to Rhodes. His departure would also have coincided with changes in the balance of power. While Athens saw its power gradually eroded in the third century,³⁵ Rhodes not only maintained its independence within the new order but also gained both wealth and influence in the Aegean. Its wealth came mainly from its naval shipyards, its grain trade, its role in trade with Egypt, and its banking center, and it even supplanted Athens as guardian of safety on the Aegean sea.³⁶ Its growing wealth, power, and ambitions were displayed in magnificent statuary, including a “Charioteer of Helios” by Lysippus³⁷ as well as the famous Colossus, a huge statue of Helios erected early in the third century and visible from afar.³⁸

The evidence for Hieronymus’ stay in Athens is meager but conclusive. Two items involve celebrations for the birthday of Halcyoneus, the son of Antigonus and an Athenian *hetaira*. Halcyoneus was born around 290 and may have received his education in Athens.³⁹ Another involves the teaching of Arcesilaus and Hieronymus. There is also an argument from silence.

First, Diogenes Laertius relates in his life of Arcesilaus (4.41–2 = 4 White) that Antigonus Gonatas asked Hieronymus to organize an annual party for the birthday of his son Halcyoneus, and the king provided money sufficient for the celebration (πρὸς ἀπόλαυσιν). On these occasions, some of the guests criticized Arcesilaus (μάλιστα δὲ ἐπετίθεντο αὐτῷ [sc. Arcesilaus] παρὰ Ἱερωνύμῳ τῷ Περιπατητικῷ). The event also included typical sympotic activities: drinking-cups were passed around and guests were invited to deliver learned discourses. On one occasion, Aridelus (or Arideices) posed a question for Arcesilaus,

³⁵ Macedonian control of the Piraeus had serious consequences for Athens: Habicht (1979) 81–2, 95–112, Habicht (1995) 129–46.

³⁶ Strabo 14.2.5 (652). Berthold (1984) 44–58, Bresson (1988) 145–53, Lund (1999) 187–204, Rostovzev ((1973) 88–106.

³⁷ Pliny *NH* 34.63: *nobilitatur Lysippus . . . in primis vero quadriga cum Sole Rhodiorum*.

³⁸ Pliny *NH* 34.41: *ante omnis autem in admiratione fuit Solis colossus Rhodi, quem fecerat Chares Lindius, Lysippi supra dicti discipulus. LXX cubitorum altitudinis fuit. Hoc simulacrum post LXVI annum terrae motu prostratum, sed iacens quoque miraculo est*. See Thieme (1988) 164–9.

³⁹ Tarn (1913) 247–8 n. 92, Ferguson (1911) 169 n. 2, Habicht (1979) 72–3, Habicht (1994) 235.

who avoided answering with a witty rejoinder.⁴⁰ Moreover, when a student of Arcesilaus said he preferred the teaching of Hieronymus, Arcesilaus himself took him to study with Hieronymus (D.L. 4.42 = **5** White). That indicates that Hieronymus' teaching enjoyed some success in Athens, which makes Arcesilaus' gesture all the more magnanimous.

Diogenes Laertius also reports hostility between Hieronymus and Lyco in Athens (5.67–8 = **6** White). This may have involved personal rivalry. But it also had a political dimension: Antigonos favored Hieronymus and criticized the rhetoric of Lyco (D.L. 5.65 = **1.10–14** SFOD),⁴¹ who had ties instead to Eumenes and Attalus of Pergamum (D.L. 5.67 = **1.34–6** SFOD). Lyco, moreover, was the only colleague who did not attend the festivities organised by Hieronymus in honor of Halcyoneus. Antigonos' criticism of Lyco, which is in tune with the kind of criticism found in the fragments of Hieronymus' rhetorical work,⁴² shows that the hostility between the two Peripatetics was more than personal and involved the highest political spheres.

Further evidence comes from the absence of Hieronymus where we would expect to find him mentioned. Strato's will does not name him at all, either among the executors nor as a candidate to lead the Lyceum. On the contrary, Strato designates Lyco to direct the school because nobody else was available (D.L. 5.62 = **4** SFOD).

The executors of this my will shall be Olympichus, Aristides, Mnesigenes, Hippocrates, Epicrates, Gorgylus, Diocles, Lyco, Athanes. I leave the school to Lyco, since of the rest some are too old and others too busy [ἐπειδὴ τῶν ἄλλων οἱ μὲν εἰσι πρεσβύτεροι, οἱ δὲ ἄσχολοι]. But it would be well if the others would cooperate with him. I also give and bequeath to him all my books,

⁴⁰ The mss. have 'Αρίδηλον, which was emended to 'Αριδείκην by Wilamowitz (1881) 75 n. 42 and 77; cf. *LGPN* 1 s.v. 'Αριδείκην, and *DPhA* A 330. This name also appears in a Rhodian sepulchral inscription with lettering very similar to the Hieronymus inscription; Hiller (1912) 229–39 proposed that this is the same Arideices.

⁴¹ Wilamowitz (1881) 83 attributes this passage to Antigonos of Carystos; but I agree with Wehrli (1968) 25 and Dorandi (1999) lxvi, that D.L. refers to Antigonos Gonatas. Contrast the plural here (διὸ δὴ καὶ ~~φρα~~σιν 'Αντίγονον ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦτο εἰπεῖν) with the explicit reference to the biographer in 5.67 (καθὰ φησιν 'Αντίγονος ὁ Καρύστιος).

⁴² D.L. 5.65, after calling Lyco eloquent (φραστικὸς ἄνθρωπος) and mentioning his expressive power, cites Antigonos' criticism of his style, which suggests disfavor toward Hieronymus' adversary. Antigonos' judgment could be influenced by the type of criticism favored by Hieronymus, who contrasted Demosthenes' style as suited for delivery with Isocrates' style as suited only for reading (**38A–B**).

except those of which I am the author, and all the furniture in the dining hall, the cushions and the drinking-cups.

Lyco was evidently chosen by a process of elimination, and Strato had to urge everyone to support him. Hieronymus is not even mentioned. But unless he was too old, which seems very unlikely at so early a date, he was either otherwise engaged or simply absent from Athens. The date can be calculated from data provided by Diogenes Laertius. First, he reports that Strato succeeded Theophrastus in the 123d Olympiad (288/4) and led the Lyceum for 18 years (5.58). Hence Lyco succeeded him between 270 and 266. Second, he reports that Lyco took over in the 127th Olympiad (272/68) and ran the school for 44 years (5.68 = 1.41–4 SFOD). This places Lyco's succession between 270 and 268. At this time, then, Hieronymus was either ἄσχολος or absent from Athens. But if he were "busy," what could be more important than leading the prestigious Lyceum? Perhaps he was giving "lectures" in other cities.⁴³ Or perhaps he never abandoned ties with his native Rhodes and returned there from time to time. His role in organizing the annual symposia in Athens honoring Antigonus' eldest son (born c. 290) raises the possibility of other commitments to the Macedonian king.

Antigonus, who had long maintained a garrison in the Piraeus, tightened his control of Athens after the Chremonidean War.⁴⁴ I suspect that the annual feast in honor of his son, for which he gave large sums to Hieronymus, was intended to gain support from the intellectuals in this hostile city. In a letter written around 276, Antigonus tells "Hieronymus" that he has brought to his court the poets Aratus, Antagoras of Rhodes, and Alexander of Aetolia, and the Stoic philosopher Persaeus ("Incerta" **57A–B** White). This letter was written, I suggest, not to the court historian Hieronymus of Cardia, who lived in Pella with Antigonus and did not need to receive such news by letter, but rather to Hieronymus of Rhodes, who was then working in Athens, and who might therefore welcome this news from Pella and perhaps visit the court too. His Macedonian ties, I suggest, would also explain why Hieronymus was considered too "busy" for Strato to select him as successor. Moreover, the choice of Hieronymus to lead the Lyceum would have given the school a clear political connotation.

⁴³ This was standard practice for Hellenistic philosophers; see Guarducci (1929), Scholz in this volume, cf. Marrou (1950) 285.

⁴⁴ Habicht (1979) 81–2, 95–112.

Lyco's hostility and these ties with Antigonos, I suggest, were the two chief factors that led Hieronymus to leave Athens, probably shortly before Antigonos went to war against Athens in 267.⁴⁵ He returned, it seems, to his native Rhodes, which offered great attractions. After Athens declared Antigonos an open enemy and began a war that would last until 262 and end in defeat and occupation by Macedonian troops, and after the hostile Lyco became head of the Lyceum—a post he would hold for 44 years—Hieronymus would have found life increasingly difficult in Athens.

The literary evidence for Hieronymus' activity in Athens, I suggest, refers only to the decades preceding the war. The episode of Arcesilaus losing a student to Hieronymus is more plausible before Arcesilaus took over the Academy (between 268 and 265) and Athens declared war on Antigonos.⁴⁶ After that, the scholarch's greater authority and the obvious political risks would have made such a decision by a young student far more difficult. Similarly, the annual gatherings on Halcyoneus' birthday probably took place before 272 (when Pyrrhus died) and not, as most scholars maintain, after Halcyoneus died (around 262).⁴⁷ No ancient source connects these birthday celebrations with Halcyoneus' death, and they seem more suited to his youth in the early 270s, when Antigonos had high hopes for his first-born son and also political motives for sponsoring lavish annual festivities in Athens.⁴⁸ By contrast,

⁴⁵ Tarn (1913): "What is certain is that from 276 to 273 Athens stood in some loose connection with Antigonos, under which Antigonos was treated as a 'king' and for which connection the term 'suzerainty' may be used." But Habicht (1979) 68–86 and (1995) 129–53 disputes this and entitles his (1995) chapter on Athens during 287–262 "Die unabhängige Stadt." While Antigonos did not control Athens directly until after the Chremonidean War, he garrisoned the Piraeus in the 280s and 270s; Habicht (1979) 68–86, 95–112. That suggests that Athens was tightly restricted and that Antigonos tried to influence events indirectly. This, then, is the context for Hieronymus' ties with Antigonos.

⁴⁶ Crates died in the 128th Olympiad (D.L. 4.23); Arcesilaus then took over the Academy (4.32).

⁴⁷ So Ferguson (1911) 233, Arrighetti (1954) 116. I do not see why Habicht (1979) 73 and (1994) 235 accepts this view that the feast was posthumous, begun only after the Chremonidean War gave Antigonos control of the city.

⁴⁸ D.L. 4.40–2 = Hieron. 4 reports that the celebrations hosted by Hieronymus (παρὰ Ἱερωνύμῳ τῇ Περιπατητικῇ: only the late cod. D has οἱ περὶ Ἱερώνυμον τὸν Περιπατητικόν) were on "the day of Halcyoneus" (εἰς τὴν Ἀλκυονέως τοῦ Ἀντιγόνου υἱοῦ ἡμέραν). For Antigonos' eulogy to his son's courage, see Ael. *VH* 3.5: ἐπαινέσας δὲ ὡς ἀγαθὸν στρατιώτην, θάπτειν προσέταξεν; cf. [Plut.] *Cons. Apoll.* 119 C–D:

Antigonus treated his son severely later in his life: when Halcyoneus had King Pyrrhus of Epirus decapitated in 272, he was sharply reprimanded and punished by his father.⁴⁹ Moreover, soon after Antigonus married Phila (probably in 276/5), he acquired a fully legitimate son, Demetrius II.⁵⁰

On our interpretation, then, Hieronymus' time in Athens fell during the years when Strato led the Lyceum and within the lifetime of both Epicurus (who died in 271/0)⁵¹ and Zeno (who died in 261).⁵² This was also when Antigonus' half-brother Craterus compiled his nine books of Athenian decrees, a work that follows Peripatetic methods of antiquarian collection and classification.⁵³ This vibrant period for the philosophical schools and Athenian cultural life soon declined when the leading protagonists died.⁵⁴

Rhodes in the Third Century

During this period, Rhodes grew significantly in wealth and power. Most famous of the many monuments to this prosperity was the Colossus, an immense statue of Helios, 32 metres tall, erected to commemorate the city's successful resistance to a siege by Demetrius Poliorcetes, and completed around 290.⁵⁵ Also significant is an epigram describing it. Its lofty tone and elegant diction proclaim the island's heroic heritage as a basis for its independence and rule over land and sea, which is represented by the colossal statue of Helios reaching up (the verb is

“ὦ Ἀλκυονεῦ, ὁψίτερον μετήλλαξας τὸν βίον, οὕτως ἀφειδῶς ἐξορμῶν πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους καὶ οὔτε τῆς σπαντοῦ σωτηρίας οὔτε τῶν ἐμῶν παραινέσεων φροντίζων.”

⁴⁹ Plut. *Pyrr.* 34, Tarn (1913) 273–4.

⁵⁰ Tarn (1913) 173–4, Gabbert (1997) 28.

⁵¹ Susemihl (1891) 94, Steinmetz (1969) 123. On Hieronymus' contacts with Epicureans, see Susemihl 148, Arrighetti (1954) 120–3, Schneider (1969) vol. 2 569, Habicht (1994) 235.

⁵² For the chronology of Zeno, see Dorandi (1982) 109–11.

⁵³ Craterus, *FGrH* 342. Jacoby, in his commentary (*FGrH* 3B, 95), cites as models for his work Aristotle's *Politeiai* and *Dikaionomata*, Theophrastus' *Nomoi*, and Demetrius of Phalerum *Περὶ τῶν Ἀθηνῆνσι πολιτειῶν* and *Περὶ τῆς Ἀθηνῆνσι νομοθεσίας*.

⁵⁴ Ferguson (1911) 184–7, Steinmetz (1969) 122–34, Habicht (1994) 231–44, and (1995) 146.

⁵⁵ Laurenzi (1958–66) 760. Verses recorded by Strabo 14.2.5 (652) specify a height of 70 cubits (ὅν φησιν ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἱαμβεῖον ὅτι “ἐπτάκις δέκα Χάρης ἐποίη πηχέων ὁ Λίνδιος”); cf. Pliny *NH* 34.41 (in n. 38 above).

μακύνω) to the heights of Olympus—a vision not without *hubris*. The epigram is preserved as *Anth. Pal.* 6.171:

Αὐτῷ σοὶ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον ἐμακύναντο κολοσσόν
 τόνδε Ῥόδου ναέται Δωρίδος, Ἀέλιε,
 χάλκεον, ἀνίκα κῦμα κατευνάσαντες Ἐνυοῦς
 ἔσπεψαν πάτρην δυσμενέων ἐνάροις.
 οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ πελάγους μόνον ἄνθεσαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν γᾶ
 ἄβρὸν ἀδουλώτου φέγγος ἐλευθερίας·
 τοῖς γὰρ ἄφ' Ἡρακλῆος ἀεξηθεῖσι γενέθλας
 πάτριος ἐν πόντῳ κῆν χθονὶ κοιρανία.

To thy very self, O Helios, did the people of Dorian Rhodes raise high to heaven this Colossus made of bronze, when having laid to rest the wave of war, they crowned their country with the spoils of their foes. Not only over the sea but on the land, too, did they establish the lovely light of unfettered freedom. For to those who spring from the race of Heracles dominion is a heritage both on land and sea.

One of the seven wonders of the ancient world, the statue stood from 290 until an earthquake brought it down in 224/3. Its duration thus corresponds closely with the life span of Hieronymus.

The vigorous intellectual life of Rhodes attracted men of culture from around the Greek world.⁵⁶ Some came already in the fourth century. The Athenian orator Aeschines, who settled there after losing his case against Demosthenes, may have played a role in founding the school of rhetoric that was to become so famous.⁵⁷ In the first half of the third century, Bion of Borysthenes also left Athens for Rhodes, which he found congenial for teaching philosophy.⁵⁸ Rhodes also attracted Apollonius Rhodius, the erudite poet from Ptolemaic Alexandria.⁵⁹ The notorious attack on the Telchines in the prologue to Callimachus' *Aitia* (where the *Schol. Flor.* on *Aet.* 1.1–12 say these legendary first inhabitants of Rhodes stand for Praxiphanes and

⁵⁶ See Mygind (1999) for an exhaustive list of “intellectuals on Rhodes” from 408/7 BCE to the second century; cf. n. 61 below.

⁵⁷ *Vita Aeschin.* 3.3–5 Dilts, *Suda* s.v. Aeschines, *POxy* 1800; see Martin (1973) 9–10. For his time on Rhodes, see Mygind (1999) 259 no. 20.

⁵⁸ Ἐν Ῥόδῳ τὰ ῥητορικὰ διασκοῦντων Ἀθηναίων τὰ φιλοσοφούμενα ἐδίδασκε (D.L. 4.49 = Bion F 4 Kindstrand; cf. D.L. 4.53 = T 3 Kindstrand). For Bion on Rhodes, see Mygind (1999) 254 no. 4.

⁵⁹ *Vitae Ap. Rhod.* 1 and 2, Strabo 14.2.13 (655), Mygind (1999) 272 no. 69.

others)⁶⁰ indicates the prominence of Rhodes in contemporary literary disputes.

Rhodes also had a Peripatetic school, which would have given Hieronymus another reason to return to his homeland.⁶¹ Strabo, when he lists famous intellectuals from Rhodes (14.2.13 = 1A White), names Hieronymus between Praxiphanes and Eudemus without clarifying the chronological order (ἔτι δὲ πρότερον Πραξιφάνης καὶ Ἱερώνυμος καὶ Εὐδήμος). Eudemus was a contemporary of Theophrastus in Aristotle's Lyceum. According to an account reported by Aulus Gellius (NA 13.5.1–12), Aristotle could not decide which of his two colleagues should lead the school after him, and only on his death-bed did he choose Theophrastus, with the comment that the wines of Rhodes and Lesbos were both very good but the Lesbian was more pleasing (ἡδίων ὁ Λέσβιος).⁶² Evidently, Eudemus then returned to Rhodes, where he seems to have founded a Peripatetic school. There he continued working on Aristotelian theories,⁶³ corresponded with Theophrastus in the Lyceum, and fostered the close study of Aristotle's texts.⁶⁴ This school is probably what brought Praxiphanes of Mytilene to Rhodes, provided that the Praxiphanes mentioned in the Callimachus scholium (Prax. fr. 15 Wehrli; cf. Clem. Alex. I = Prax. fr. 10) is identical with the Rhodian Peripatetic named by Strabo (Prax. fr. 1; cf. Epiphan. *Adv. Haer.* 3.34 = Prax. fr. 2) and elsewhere called a μαθητής of Aristotle (D.L. 3.109 = Prax. fr. 6) and ἑταῖρος (Procl. *In Plat. Tim.* 1.5c = Prax. fr. 19) or μαθητής of Theophrastus (Procl. *In Hes. Opera* = Prax. fr. 22a, Tzet. *In Hes. Opera* = fr. 22b). In that case, the label 'Ρόδιος⁶⁵ would indicate his long stay on Rhodes.⁶⁶ Others as well have argued that Eudemus started a Peripatetic school on Rhodes.⁶⁷ Since both Praxiphanes and Hieronymus are invariably called "Peripatetics," even

⁶⁰ Cf. Diod. 5.55, Strabo 14.2.7 (654).

⁶¹ See Bringmann (2002) on Rhodes "als Bildungszentrum der hellenistischen Welt." For Rhodian scholars, see van Gelder (1900) 409–22 and Mygind (1999).

⁶² Eudemus fr. 5 Wehrli = Theophr. 8 FHS&G.

⁶³ See Wehrli (1969a) 78 on Eudemus frs. 5–6, Moraux (1973) 8–10, Mygind (1999) 254 nos. 2–3.

⁶⁴ Eudemus fr. 6 = Theophr. 157 FHS&G. See Moraux (1973) 15.

⁶⁵ Praxiphanes frs. 1, 2, 6 Wehrli; Mygind (1999) 273 no. 33.

⁶⁶ Wehrli (1969b) 105.

⁶⁷ Schneider (1969) 567: "Während Theophrast die Leitung der Athener Schule übernahm, gründete Eudemos von Rhodos eine peripatetische Filiale in Rhodos."

though Hieronymus' ethical views were widely seen as close to Epicurean positions, this school probably continued for at least two more generations.

Remains of a library catalogue from the second century have also been found on the island.⁶⁸ Inscribed in stone, the catalogue lists works on rhetoric: six by Demetrius of Phalerum (80 SOD), three by Hegesias, two by Theodectes of Phaselis (including his famous Τέχνη ῥητορική, which was widely considered Aristotelian),⁶⁹ fifteen by Theopompus, and five other authors, including the orator Democles, a student of Theophrastus.⁷⁰ Although the exact provenance of this list is unknown,⁷¹ its titles reflect a Peripatetic tradition of rhetoric which was still flourishing on Rhodes at the end of the second century and which our interpretation suggests may be indebted to Hieronymus.

Hieronymus on Rhodes

Another inscription provides striking evidence of Peripatetic activity on Rhodes in the third century. An inscribed stele was found in 1904 at the foot of the acropolis of Lindus (one of three Rhodian cities that traced its foundation back to mythical times). The text was first published by Blinkenberg in 1912, and again by him in 1915 and 1941.⁷² Known as the *Chronicle of Lindus*, it lists votive offerings made to the temple of Athena in Lindus from the earliest times onward, and it was compiled by Timachidas, son of Hagesitimus, whom Blinkenberg identifies with the Rhodian scholar and poet who was active in the early first century BCE and is mentioned several times by Athenaeus.⁷³ The list cites as its sources numerous works by local historians, religious writers, and orators, including four citations of a work by Eudemus called *Lindiacus* and two from a work by Hieronymus entitled *Heliaca*. Although nothing from the *Chronicle* has previously been included in collections of fragments of Eudemus and Hieronymus, I think there are good grounds to ascribe these passages to the two Peripatetic philosophers who returned to their native island.

⁶⁸ See Segre (1935) 214–22.

⁶⁹ De Sanctis (1926) 65.

⁷⁰ Theophr. 18.6 FHS&G.

⁷¹ Segre (1935) 220–2, Nicolai (1987) 35.

⁷² Blinkenberg (1912), (1915), (1941); cf. *FGrH* 532.

⁷³ Blinkenberg (1912) 29–33.

One entry in the *Chronicle* records votive offerings made to Athena's temple by the Persians early in the fifth century (*Votives* 32 = **60B** White): a necklace (ἐνωτίδι]α καὶ στρεπτός), a tiara (τιάρα), a pair of Persian trousers (ἀναξυρίδες), and (if Blinkenberg's restoration is correct) some bracelets (φέλια) and a scimitar (ἀκινάκα). The *Chronicle* first cites Eudemus in his *Lindiacus* and two other local historians as sources. It then adds that "Hieronymus in the first Book of the *Heliaca* declares that in addition to these gifts he [sc. Artaphernes]⁷⁴ also dedicated a covered carriage, which is also reported by Polyzelus in Book 4 of the *Histories*, Aristion in Book 1 of the *Chronicles*, and Hieron in Book 1 *On Rhodes*."⁷⁵

The names Eudemus and Hieronymus appear again in an Appendix to the *Chronicle* entitled *Apparitions* (Ἐπιφάνειαι 1 = **60A**), which also cites the same sources for some Persian offerings. Here is the relevant section of the text (*ILind* 2 D 26–59):

Datis, an admiral of Darius, laughed when he heard this. But when a great darkness formed over the acropolis on the next day and heavy rain fell in the middle [of the acropolis], the besieged received abundant water, but the Persian troops very little. The barbarian was frightened at the apparition of the goddess, and he stripped off his equipment and sent as offerings his mantle [φῶρος], a necklace, bracelets, and also his tiara and scimitar, and even his covered carriage [ἀρμάμαξα]. These offerings were preserved at first, but when Eucles son of Astyanactidas was priest of Helios, the temple caught fire, and they were burned along with most of the votives. Datis returned to the tasks awaiting him, after making a treaty of friendship with the besieged and adding that "The gods protect these men." These affairs are recorded by Eudemus in the *Lindiacus*, by Ergias in Book 4 of the *Histories*, Polyzelus in Book 4 of the *Histories*, Hieronymus in Book 2 of the *Heliaca*, Myron in Book 1 of the *Encomium of Rhodes*, Timocritus in Book 1 of the *Chronicle*, Hieron in Book 1 of *On Rhodes*.⁷⁶

The *Lindiacus* of Eudemus is cited two other times, first for gifts from mythical times (by Menelaus) in *Votives* 10 (*ILind* 2 B 65), and again in *Apparitions* 2 for gifts from the fifth or fourth century (*ILind* 2 D 87–8). The two works on the local history of Rhodes by Eudemus and Hieronymus both discussed Lindus. We know nothing more about the contents of Eudemus' work. For Hieronymus' work, Blinkenberg

⁷⁴ Blinkenberg (1912) 18 ad loc.

⁷⁵ Polyzelus of Rhodes *FGrH* 521, Aristion *FGrH* 509, Hieron *FGrH* 518.

⁷⁶ Eudemus *FGrH* 524, Ergias of Rhodes *FGrH* 513, Polyzelus of Rhodes *FGrH* 521, Myron of Priene *FGrH* 106 F 4–5, Timocritus *FGrH* 522, Hieron *FGrH* 518.

originally proposed the title *Eliaca*, an ethnographic work on the city of Elis.⁷⁷ But nothing in the context supports this, and in later editions he agreed with Wilamowitz that the title must be *Heliaca*, for a work on the Rhodian cult of Helios, god of the Sun.⁷⁸ Blinkenberg still remained uncertain about the identity of Hieronymus, since he accepted Susemihl's disparaging estimate of the Peripatetic philosopher who lived in Athens.⁷⁹ Since he considered this incompatible with work on the Rhodian cult of Helios,⁸⁰ Blinkenberg refused to attribute the title to the Peripatetic; and to avoid misunderstanding in his Index, he lists both alternatives, *Heliaca* and *Eliaca*.⁸¹

We can now consider this citation in the *Chronicle of Lindus* from a different perspective. The title *Heliaca* suits the context perfectly, whereas *Eliaca* is completely extraneous. There is no problem in finding two Rhodian Peripatetics cited together. We have also seen other evidence for Hieronymus on Rhodes, to which he probably returned by 268. There was also earlier Peripatetic interest in the local history of Rhodes, both a *Rhodian Politeia* attributed to Aristotle (Gigon, pp. 699–701) and the *Lindiacus* by his colleague Eudemus. The “Charioteer of Helios” by Lysippus and the Colossus with its dedicatory epigram indicate that Hieronymus' work on Helios and his descendants was fully in line with a dominant cultural theme of third-century Rhodes.⁸²

Μετὰ δὲ τοὺς Τελχίνας οἱ Ἡλιάδαι μυθεύονται κατασχεῖν τὴν νῆσον, ὧν ἑνὸς Κερκάφου καὶ Κυδίππης γενέσθαι παῖδας τοὺς τὰς πόλεις κτίσαντας ἐπωνύμους αὐτῶν “Λίνδον Ἰηλυσόν τε καὶ ἀργινόνεττα Κάμειρον.”

After the Telchines, legend has it that the Heliadae took over the island; and to one of them, Cercaphus, and his wife Cydippe were born children who founded the cities named after them, “Lindus, Ialysus, and Cameirus white with chalk.” [Strabo 14.2.8 (654)]

Ialysus is where the gravestone of Hieronymus son of Simylinus of Tlos was found, and it traced its origin back to the descendants of

⁷⁷ Blinkenberg (1912) 18 and (1915) 28–9.

⁷⁸ Wilamowitz (1913) 44.

⁷⁹ Susemihl (1891) 148.

⁸⁰ Blinkenberg (1912) 106 and (1915) 29.

⁸¹ Blinkenberg (1915) 48.

⁸² Wilamowitz (1913) 44: “Von Helios und seinem Geschlechte.” On the cult of Helios, see Morelli (1959) 15–20, 94–9.

Helios. We also get some indication about the contents of Hieronymus' *Heliaca* from the *Chronicles of Lindus*. His work is cited for events in the early fifth century, when Lindus was besieged by the Persians in 490. His first book listed gifts to Athena's temple from the Persian Artaphernes. His second book discussed the siege by Datis and the later fire which destroyed almost all the votives (including those from the Persians). It also dated this event precisely by naming the priest of Helios then in office: ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ Ἀλίου Εὐκλεῦς τοῦ Ἀστυανακτίδα (*ILind* 2 D 39–40).⁸³ Although we have no other firm evidence for the *Heliaca*, the second-century Rhodian historian Zeno may be indebted to it since his own Χρονικὴ σύνταξις recounted at length legends about the Rhodian descendants of Helios, the Heliadae.⁸⁴ Hieronymus also wrote on tragedy, and both Aeschylus and Euripides wrote plays about the Heliadae: *Heliadae* and *Phaethon*, respectively.⁸⁵ His contemporary Apollonius of Rhodes also mentions the Heliadae in his *Argonautica* (4.604).

Hieronymus may also have discussed another votive offering to Athena of Lindus. Blinkenberg suggests that a priceless mantle made by the famous weaver Helicon of Cyprus, which the city of Rhodes gave to Alexander the Great, was one of the offerings that Cyprus sent to the temple of Athena. Blinkenberg cites Plutarch's *Alexander* (59C White),⁸⁶ but a parallel from Athenaeus (59A) suggests that the information may come from our Hieronymus.

Conclusion

My hypothesis that Hieronymus continued work after returning to Rhodes has important implications, and assigning the *Heliaca* to him raises intriguing possibilities. His work on ethics (11–36 White) suits the philosophical debates in Athens during the early decades of the third century. But his work on poetry and rhetoric has been difficult to

⁸³ Blinkenberg (1912) 133: "On peut certainement se fier à l'indication chronologique sur l'incendie lindien, que l'un ou l'autre des auteurs cités aura puisée dans des documents authentiques." Their Peripatetic background makes it likely that Eudemus and Hieronymus consulted archives for their data.

⁸⁴ Zeno of Rhodes *FGrH* 523.

⁸⁵ Aesch. T 78.5c and frs. 68–73a Radt; Eur. *Phaethon* frs. 771–86 Nauck; cf. the *Heliadae* by Pamphilus (fr. 51 in *TrGF* 1.189–90).

⁸⁶ Blinkenberg (1912) 70.

assess,⁸⁷ and both it and the possibility of work on Orphism and mystery religion⁸⁸ may now be considered in the context of the intellectual and religious life of third-century Rhodes. The evidence is very complex, and I must defer detailed discussion. Here I offer only a brief survey of Hieronymus' scholarly interests, which spanned rhetoric, poetry, grammar, mythology, biography, history, and religion:

- Historical interpretation: the fall of tyrannies in relation to ephebic practices and homosexual love, with conclusions of a socio-psychological nature (35).
- Education of the young (31) and didactic methods (32).
- “Lives” of poets, philosophers, and political leaders reconstructed on the basis of anecdotes: Thales (47–8), Empedocles (52), Sophocles (43A–C), Pericles and Anaxagoras (49), Socrates (53A–C), Phaedo of Elis (54), and an anonymous female philosopher (55). Some cases highlight erotic aspects (33–4, 36A–C).⁸⁹
- Questions of attribution: works by Empedocles destroyed by his daughter, and his forty-three tragedies (52).⁹⁰
- Chronological questions about poets and their work: Terpander (41).
- Criticism of poets and orators: the iambic versions of Heraclitus by Skythinos (51); Isocrates' use of verse rhythms (37A). Together with a reference from Rufinus (37B), this continues Aristotle's and Theophrastus' interest in metrics and prose rhythm.⁹¹
- Rhetorical style: a work *On the Isocratean Figures* (39).
- Questions of delivery, following work by Theophrastus and Demetrius of Phalerum (38A–B).⁹²
- Exegetical work on poetry: the *Shield* ascribed to Hesiod (45). Andrea Martano's study in this volume indicates how well this work fits the Rhodian tradition of literary scholarship.
- Study of acoustics: Hieronymus is named with Aristoxenos and Dicaearchus (40).
- Grammatical observations on phonology and etymology (29).

⁸⁷ Cf. Susemihl's severe judgment (1891) 148: “ein Mann . . . von sehr oberflächlicher Bildung.”

⁸⁸ West (1983) 177 denies Hieronymus' authorship of 61A–B, which White labels “Incerta.”

⁸⁹ *Bioi* in Heraclides Ponticus fr. 45 Wehrli, Dicaearchus frs. 33–52 Mirhady, Clearchus frs. 37–62 Wehrli, Aristoxenos frs. 47–68 Wehrli.

⁹⁰ Wehrli (1969c) 37–8.

⁹¹ Arist. *Rhet.* 3.8, Theophr. 698–704 FHS&G.

⁹² Theophr. 1.236 = 666.24, 712, 713 FHS&G, Demetr. Phal. frs. 134–9 SOD.

- Study of myth: Anagyrus and the *Phoenix* of Euripides (**42A–C**), Tithonus (**46A–B**). The latter, which was discussed earlier by Hellanicus and Plato⁹³ and later by the Peripatetic Ariston,⁹⁴ also figures in the Prologue of Callimachus' *Aitia* by (fr. 1.31–6 Pf.).⁹⁵
- Rationalisation of myth: a humanized Heracles (**44A–B**; cf. Euhemerus and Dicaearchus a little earlier), and the descent into Hades by Pythagoras and punishment of Hesiod and Homer (**50**; cf. Dicaearchus on Pythagoras, frs. 40–2 Mirhady).

This material is only a tiny fraction of an extensive corpus which may have been still larger. The *Chronicle of Lindus*, for example, records works by Eudemus and by Hieronymus not known from literary sources. So I would add the *Heliaca* to Hieronymus' work on literary topics: *Περὶ ποιητῶν* (**41**) in at least five books, including both *Περὶ κιθαρωδῶν* (**41**) and *Περὶ τραγωδιοποιῶν* (**42A**), *Περὶ μέθης* (**28–9**), *Περὶ τῶν Ἰσοκρατικῶν σχημάτων* (**39**), *Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα* (**33–4**), *Σποράδην ὑπομνήματα* (**47, 49**), and *Ἐπιστολαί* (**30**).

Two other passages which White labels “Incerta” also deserve mention. One is from an Orphic theogony ascribed by Damascius to “Hieronymus and Hellanicus” (**61A**). The attribution to the Peripatetic Hieronymus was strongly opposed by West, who claims that “it would be extremely surprising if it [sc. his *Περὶ ποιητῶν*] contained such details of the contents of an Orphic poem as Damascius has. A more promising candidate is Hieronymus the Egyptian . . . a writer of Phoenician antiquities of late Hellenistic or early Imperial date.”⁹⁶ But there is no longer good reason to deny Hieronymus of Rhodes an interest in Orphism, especially when Eudemus also had an interest in it (fr. 150 Wehrli, also from Damascius). His book *On Citharodes* would be a natural place to discuss Orpheus. And recall the initiation depicted in the underworld scene on the relief from his grave. This aspect of his work should therefore be reconsidered without prejudice.

The other is an epitaph (*IG* 12.1 141 = *GVI* 1916 = **58**), which now appears more compatible with Hieronymus. Some scholars have denied that it is for him.⁹⁷ But Hiller and Robert held that it refers to the fig-

⁹³ Hellanicus F 114 *FGrH* 4, Plato *Phaedr.* 259.

⁹⁴ Ariston 18 *SFOD*.

⁹⁵ The myth of Tithonus was also in *Hom. Hymn* 5.218–38.

⁹⁶ West (1983) 177.

ures on the funerary relief, and their hypothesis has not been disproven.⁹⁸ The picture of Hieronymus that I have sketched puts this epitaph in a new light. Neither its provenance nor that of the relief is known, so a common origin remains only a possibility. But the epitaph is dedicated to a teacher who deserved after death to be *μυστικῶν ἐπιστάτης*.⁹⁹ The relief similarly juxtaposes a school scene during life with scenes of transformation in the afterlife. Both show a strong interest in religion and specifically sacred initiation.

Works Cited

- Abrahams, E. 1908. *Greek Dress* (London: Murray); reprinted in D. M. Johnson, ed., *Ancient Greek Dress* (Chicago 1964: Argonaut).
- Arrighetti, G. 1954. "Ieronimo di Rodi," *Studi Classici ed Orientali* 3: 111–28.
- B., E. P. 1930. "New Items from Athens," *American Journal of Archaeology* 34: 218–21.
- Bauer, J. 2002. "Sogenannt Damatriosrelief (Nr. 71)," in *Gips nicht mehr: Abgüsse als letzte Zeugen antiker Kunst*, ed. J. Bauer and W. Geomring (Bonn: Akademisches Kunstmuseum, Universität Bonn).
- Bérard, C. 1974. *Anodoi: Essai sur l'imagerie des passages chthoniens* (Neuchâtel: Institut Suisse de Rome).
- Berthold, R. 1984. *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age* (Ithaca: Cornell University).
- Bianchi, U. 1976. *The Greek Mysteries = Iconography of Religions* 17.3 (Leiden: Brill).

⁹⁷ Marrou (1950) 513 n. 13, Arrighetti (1954) 127.

⁹⁸ Hiller and Robert (1902) 140–2.

⁹⁹ I think the epitaph has been misunderstood. Kaibel's restoration [Γ]ρά[μμ]α[τ]ῖ' ἐδίδαξεν may mean not "he taught reading" (sc. in elementary school), but rather "he taught literature"; cf. Aristotle teaching Alexander in *Hist. Alex.* 16.11, Philiscus teaching Alexander in Hermippus fr. 37 Wehrli, and the tyrant Dionysius in Corinth in Aristox. fr. 31 Wehrli. These γράμματα may be either "poems" (cf. Callim. frs. 398, 468, 532 with Pfeiffer's apparatus) or "treatises" (cf. Plato *Parm.* 127c, 128a; Callim. *Epigr.* 23); and in Callim. fr. 468, γράμματα ἀπόκρυφα seem to be "sacred poems" or "rare treatises" (see Pfeiffer's apparatus; cf. *Liber Jubilaeorum* fr. n. [4.18 Denis], *Testamenta XII Patriarchorum* 3.13.2 De Jonge).

- Bieber, M. 1928. *Griechische Kleidung* (Berlin and Leipzig: De Gruyter).
- . 1961. *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (New York: Columbia University).
- Blinkenberg, C. 1912. *La Chronique du Temple Lindien* (Copenhagen: Bianco Luno).
- . 1915. *Die lindische Tempelchronik* (Bonn: Marcus & Weber).
- and K. F. Kinch. 1941. *Lindus: Fouilles de l'Acropole 1902–1914*, vol. 2: *Inscriptions* (Berlin and Copenhagen: De Gruyter).
- Boyancé, P. 1937. *Le culte des muses chez les philosophes grecs* (Paris: de Boccard).
- Bresson, A. 1988. "Richesse et pouvoir à Lindos à l'époque hellénistique," in Dietz and Papachristodoulou, 145–54.
- Briem, O. E. 1941. *Les Sociétés secrètes de mystères* (Paris: Payot).
- Bringmann, K. 2002. "Rhodos als Bildungszentrum der hellenistischen Welt," *Chiron* 32: 65–81.
- Burkert, W. 1987. *Ancient Mystery Cults* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Chantraine, P. 1968–80. *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris: Klincksieck).
- Curtius, L. 1951. "Zum sogenannten Relief eines Schulmeisters aus Rhodos und zum Unterweltsarkophag von Ephesos," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 4: 20–32.
- Davies, M. and J. Kathirithamby. 1986. *Greek Insects* (Oxford: Oxford University).
- De Sanctis, G. 1926. "Epigraphica VII. La biblioteca di Rodi," *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione classica* n.s. 4: 65.
- de Waele, F. J. M. 1927. *The Magic Staff or Rod in Graeco-Italian Antiquity* (Gent: Erasmus).
- Dietz, S. and I. Papachristodoulou, eds. 1988. *Archaeology in the Dodecanese* (Copenhagen: National Museum of Denmark).
- Dorandi, T. 1982. "Filodemo: *Gli Stoici* (PHerc. 155 e 339)," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 12: 91–133.
- . 1987. "Filodemo e l'Accademia nuova (PHerc. 1021, XVII–XXVI)," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 17: 119–34.
- . 1999. *Antigone de Caryste: Fragments* (Paris: Belles Lettres).
- Ferguson, W. S. 1911. *Hellenistic Athens* (London: Macmillan).

- Fraser, P. M. 1977. *Rhodian Funerary Monuments* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Freier, H. 1963. *Caput velare* (Dissertation Tübingen).
- Furtwängler, A. 1900. *Die antiken Gemmen* (Leipzig & Berlin: Gesecke & Devrient).
- Gabbert, J. J. 1997. *Antigonos II Gonatas. A Political Biography* (London & New York: Routledge).
- Gabrielsen, V., ed. 1999. *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society* (Aarhus: Aarhus University).
- Gaiser, K. 1980. *Das Philosophenmosaik in Neapel: eine Darstellung der platonischen Akademie = Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Kl. (Heidelberg: Winter).
- Guarducci, M. 1929. "Poeti vaganti e conferenzieri dell'età ellenistica," *Memorie della R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, Classe di scienze morali, storiche, e filologiche 326: 629–65.
- . 1995². *Epigrafia Greca* 1 (Rome: Istituto Poligrafico).
- Guldager Bilde, P. 1999. "Dionysios among Tombs: Aspects of Rhodian Tomb Culture in the Hellenistic Period," in Gabrielsen (1999) 227–46.
- Günter, H. 1919. *Kalypso* (Halle: Niemeyer).
- Habicht, C. 1979. *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte Athens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Munich: Beck).
- . 1994. *Athen in Hellenistischer Zeit* (Munich: Beck).
- . 1995. *Athen: Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit* (Munich: Beck).
- Heuzey, L. 1922. *Histoire du costume antique* (Paris: Champion).
- Hiller von Gærtringen, F. 1912. "Arideikes und Hieronymos von Rhodos," *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 36: 229–39.
- . 1942. Rezension zu Blinkenberg and Kinch (1941), in *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 204.5: 161–9.
- and C. Robert. 1902. "Relief von dem Grabmal eines Rhodischen Schulmeisters," *Hermes* 37: 121–43.
- Immisch, J. O. 1915. "Sprachliches zum Seelenschmetterling," *Glotta* 6: 193–206.
- Jacoby, F. 1955. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* 3B: Kommentar (Leiden: Brill).
- Keller, O. 1913. *Die Antike Tierwelt* (Leipzig: Engelmann).

- Kontorini, V. 1983. *Inscriptions inédites relatives à l'histoire et aux cultes de Rhodes au IIe et au Ier s. av. J.C.*, *Rhodiaka* 1 (Louvain-La-Neuve: Institut supérieur d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art, Collège Érasme).
- Laurenzi, L. 1958–66. "Rodia, arte ellenistica," in *Enciclopedia dell'arte antica classica e orientale* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia italiana) 6.760–3.
- Losfeld, G. 1991. *Essai sur le Costume grec* (Paris: de Boccard).
- Lund, J. 1999. "Rhodian Amphorae and Alexandria as Evidence of Trade," in Gabrielsen (1999), 187–204.
- Marrou, H. I. 1950. *Storia dell'educazione nell'antichità* (Rome: Stuidium).
- Martin, V. 1927. *Eschine: Discours*, vol. 1 (Paris: Collection Budé).
- Moraux, P. 1973. *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen* 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- Morelli, D. 1959. *I culti in Rodi = Studi Classici ed Orientali* 8.
- Mygind, B. 1999. "Intellectuals in Rhodes," in Gabrielsen (1999), 247–93.
- Nicolai, R. 1987. "Le biblioteche dei ginnasi," *Nuovi Annali* 1.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1950. *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion* 2 (Munich: Beck).
- . 1957. *The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age* (Lund: Gleerup).
- Navarre, O. 1925. *Le Théâtre grec* (Paris: Payot).
- Petersen, E. 1897. "Über zwei Mosaiks und ihr Urbild," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Römische Abteilung* 12: 328–35.
- Pfuhl, E. and H. Möbius. 1977–9. *Die Ostgriechischen Grabreliefs* (Mainz am Rhein: von Zabern).
- Rostovzev, M. 1973. *Storia economica e sociale del mondo ellenistico* (trans. *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, London 1953; Firenze: Nuova Italia).
- Schneider, C. 1969. *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus*, vol. 2 (Munich: Beck).
- Scholl, A. 1994. "Πολυτάλαντα μνημεῖα: Zur literarischen und monumentalen Überlieferung aufwendiger Grabmäler im spät-klassischen Athen," *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 109: 239–71.

- Segre, M. 1935. "Epigraphica I: Catalogo di libri da Rodi," *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione classica* n.s. 13: 214–22.
- Siebert, G. 1990. "Hermes," *LIMC* 5.1 (Zürich & Munich: Artemis) 285–387.
- Steinmetz, P. 1969. "Die Krise der Philosophie in der Zeit des Hochhellenismus," *Antike und Abendland* 15: 122–34.
- Susemihl, F. 1891. *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit* 1 (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Tarn, W. W. 1913. *Antigonos Gonatas* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Thieme, T. 1988. "The Canon of Pliny for the Colossus of Rhodes and the Statue of Athena Parthenos," in Dietz and Papachristodoulou, 164–9.
- van Gelder, H. 1900. *Geschichte der alten Rhodier* (Hague: Nijhoff).
- Waser, O. 1909. "Psyche," in *Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*, vol. 3, ed. W. H. Roscher (Leipzig: Teubner) 3201–56.
- Wehrli, F. 1968. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 6: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (Basel: Schwabe).
- . 1969a. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 8: *Eudemos von Rhodos* (Basel: Schwabe).
- . 1969b. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 9: *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes* (Basel: Schwabe).
- . 1969c. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 10: *Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler* (Basel: Schwabe).
- West, M. 1983. *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Wiesner, J. 1938. *Grab und Jenseits: Untersuchungen im Ägäischen Raum zur Bronzezeit und frühen Eisenzeit* (Berlin: Töpelmann).
- Wilamowitz von Moellendorff, U. 1881. *Antigonos von Karystos* (Berlin & Zurich: Weidmann).
- . 1913. "Die Lindische Tempelchronik," *Jahresbericht des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts = Archäologischer Anzeiger* 28: 42–6.
- . 1931. *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (Berlin: Weidmann).
- Xagorari, M. 1994. "Rhadamanthys," *LIMC* 7.1 (Zurich & Munich: Artemis) 676–8.

5

Peripatetic Philosophers as Wandering Scholars: Some Remarks on the Socio-Political Conditions of Philosophizing in the Third Century BCE*

Peter Scholz

1.

When a historian examines the social and political conditions of philosophizing (as distinct from philosophy) in the third century BCE, the reader may ask: From the viewpoint of social and cultural history is it really justifiable to separate the fourth from the third century, and to treat the third as an autonomous and distinct period? The question can be formulated in another way: In what respect does the third century differ from the fourth and second centuries? What do they have in common, what are the connecting features and traditions? What are the differences, and where are discontinuity and changes which initially developed below the surface and did not come to light until the end of the process?

* This article was written as part of the research program "Wissenskultur und gesellschaftlicher Wandel" (Forschungskolleg/SFB 435 B 1) at the University of Frankfurt/Main, Germany.

In my opinion, there are good reasons for viewing the third century as an age of its own, and the year 307 BCE is a suitable starting point. This date is important for the social history of philosophy, because this was when Athenian philosophers were for the last time forced to go into exile. Some left for only a short while, others for longer, driven out by external factors, above all in connection with political crises.¹ It is notable that Aristotle had to leave Athens twice in his life: first in the summer of 348, when as a result of the anti-Macedonian propaganda of Demosthenes, he was suspected of collaboration and espionage because of his personal contacts with the Macedonian court;² and again in the summer of 323, when after the news of the death of Alexander, the anti-Macedonian movement, gaining strength again, brought a series of actions against prominent “friends of Macedonia.” Among those charged were the oligarchical politician Callimedon, the orators Pytheas (PA 12342) and Demades, and the philosopher Aristotle.³

¹ Charges against philosophers occurred in Athens only as a side effect of either constitutional changes (in 411, 404, and 307 BCE) or political crises caused by foreign policy. Cf. Scholz (1998) 62–8. On legal actions against philosophers, see also E. Derenne (1930), which is still intriguing.

² It is remarkable that Aristotle, who spent twenty years at the Academy, left just before Plato’s death (under the archon Theophilus 348/7 BCE: D.L. 5.9). This suggests that his departure is to be interpreted as the result of anti-Macedonian propaganda after the destruction of Olynthus. The suspicions (Dem. 4.18: εἰσὶν οἱ πάντ’ ἐξαγγέλλοντες ἐκεῖνῳ παρ’ ἡμῶν πλείους τοῦ δέοντος) were mainly caused by the position of Aristotle’s father as a personal physician at the Macedonian court, which was surely known to numerous Athenians, as well as his correspondence with Philip II and Olympias. For the circumstances, see Scholz (1998) 171–3, cf. Chroust (1966) 186–96, Chroust (1967) 39–43, and the summary of these two studies in Chroust (1973) 117–224. That Aristotle was accused of cooperating with the Macedonians (μακεδονισμός) remains probable but speculative, as pointed out recently by Trampedach (1994) 50–1.

³ Only two months after the announcement of Alexander’s death, the leading Athenian politicians of the time, the general Leosthenes and the orator Hypereides, declared war against the Macedonian Kingdom; see Gehrke (1976) 77–87. It is curious that Aristotle, just before his friend and patron Lycurgus died, was charged with impiety (Ath. 15 696A–B = T 1b Plezia). This prompted Aristotle to take refuge at his mother’s home in Chalcis (*Vit. Marc.* 41–2 = F 667 Rose = T 44 Düring = F 11a Plezia). Cf. Scholz (1998) 176–9, Derenne (1930) 188–98, Wormell (1935) 83–7, Chroust (1973) 145–54. On the flight of the other “friends of Macedon”: Gehrke (1976) 85, Berve (1926) 190 no. 404 Callimedon, Marzi (1991) 70–83, Blass (1898) 266–78 (Demades), 286–8, Develin no. 2655 Pytheas.

Four years later, in 318/317, his successor Theophrastus faced similar difficulties, when Hagnonides (PA 107455), a leading figure in anti-Macedonian circles who had pushed through the execution of Phocion, took legal action against the new head of the Peripatos for impiety (ἀσέβεια).⁴ Once again the real reason was surely his personal ties to the Macedonian court and his friendship with Demetrius of Phalerum, who was known for his support of Phocion's policy. However, this time the anti-Macedonian attack was not successful, as it would be in 307, when the philosophers were forced to go into exile for a short time.⁵ At that time, following the fall of Demetrius of Phalerum, a former student of Aristotle's who had donated an estate to the Peripatetic school during his rule of Athens, the democratic constitution was reestablished, and the Athenians tried to reverse his generous donation. Demochares (PA 321970), as passionate an orator and patriot as his uncle Demosthenes, initiated the prosecution. His indictment repeated the charges of collaboration with the Macedonians which had already been made in 348. By this he intended to prove the extraordinary political danger presented by the philosophers.⁶ Sophocles proposed the accusation of the philosophers, and the following law was passed by the Athenian people: "No one may lead a school of philosophy if it is not decided by the council and the people; otherwise he will be sentenced to death." But in the following year, Philon (PA 14806), a former student of Aristotle's, had the law repealed so that the philosophers could return.⁷

That was the last time politicians tried to persecute philosophers by legal and political means. Thereafter, the legal status of the philosophical schools (as associations of the Muses)⁸ was never again questioned

⁴ D.L. 5.37. Cf. Habicht (1995) 58–9.

⁵ Cf. Derenne (1930) 199–201, 213–16, Habicht (1988) 7–8, Sonnabend (1996) 118–23.

⁶ Euseb. *PE* 15.2.6 (from Aristocles) = T 58g Döring = F 1 Plezia = F 2 Marasco. For the circumstances of the proposal, see Marasco (1984) 113–20, 171–5.

⁷ D.L. 5.38. Sophocles' law obviously contravened the right to freedom of assembly and to autonomy of association (Gaius *Dig.* 47.22.4 = Solon F 75 Ruschenbusch). Cf. Whitehead (1993) 13–14.

⁸ Against Lynch and the *opinio communis*, including Habicht (1995) 112, I here follow Wilamowitz (1881) 264, 279; cf. Ziebarth (1914) 72–3. The foundation and practice of the cult of the Muses was imperative for learning and living in a philosophical community, which held daily assemblies for an indefinite period in a gymnasium on public land. But I disagree with Wilamowitz's view that the Academy was organized

by politicians, apart from the Areopagus' formal examinations of how they earned their living.⁹ Thereafter, the philosophers who lived in Athens were at least tolerated, and were no longer judged as "eccentrics."¹⁰ Thus, since 307/6 saw the establishment of philosophy as an autonomous way of life and a part of higher intellectual education, it seems an appropriate date to begin a new chapter of the social history of this form of education.

in the form of a *thiasos* and hence had the legal status of a religious association. In the gymnasia, the philosophers and other teachers were used to sacrificing to the Muses, as is well documented by Boyancé (1937). By sacrificing, philosophers proved both their recognition of the Athenian cults and their respect for the Athenian community. For further arguments, see Scholz (1998) 17 n. 17.

⁹ According to the biographical tradition, the philosophers Menedemus of Eretria, Asclepiades of Phlius, and Cleanthes of Assos were summoned by the Areopagus and questioned on how they earned their living (Ath. 4 168A–B = SSR 3 F 9; D.L. 7.168–9). Their questioning was based on Solon's law on "being unemployed or idle" (Plut. *Sol.* 22.3 = F 148e Ruschenbusch). It was required not because the Areopagus considered the three young philosophers excessive gluttons (ἄσώτους), but because philosophers were considered persons without any regular income or inheritance (μὴ ἔκ τινος περιουσίας ζῶντας: Ath. 4 168A = *FGrH* 325 F 10, 328 F 196). The Areopagus supervised citizens who risked becoming impoverished, and their questioning was supposed to function not as a deterrent but as a cautionary and solicitous measure. It is hard to believe that the Areopagus was willing to support these philosophers financially out of concern for the difficulties they faced in their daily philosophical lessons together (συσχολάζοντες), for there is no other evidence for the Areopagus making such donations; see Wallace (1989) 120–1, 205, cf. de Bruyn (1995) 135, 168–9. The Hellenistic tradition of philosophical biography probably gave rise to this version of the event, which probably did take place. The *topoi* of the genre require that the choice of a philosophical life of perfect virtue should be made as early as possible, at best in youth, and later described as the result of significant efforts.

¹⁰ See Scholz (1998) 11–71, esp. 11–14, 68–71, 372–5. My study was prompted by the observation that philosophers in the fourth century had an extremely precarious status as social outsiders, since they began in "geistesaristokratischer" manner to dissociate themselves from political life in both theory and practice and to create a new way of life for themselves. This emancipatory act, which on the institutional level was accompanied by the founding of different philosophical schools, must have disturbed the citizenry. Philosophical instruction and knowledge gradually entered general intellectual education during the third century. This process of establishing philosophical *paideia*, completed by the beginning of the second century, is reflected in literary tradition by the decreasing number of references in comedy, biographical anecdotes, and epigraphical and archaeological evidence for philosophers' lives in the fourth, third, and second centuries. The literary and monumental traditions, both of which declined from the fourth to the second century, presumably indicate changes in the social conditions of philosophizing during this time.

Philosophy was established as an accepted part of general higher education during the third century, and the process was completed around 200 BCE. During this time, for example, numerous citizens from different cities in the Greek world began to celebrate their intellectual prowess by depicting themselves on their gravestones with the attributes of their philosophical and rhetorical education.¹¹ Further confirmation of the new role of philosophy at the end of the third century is provided by an honorary decree from Samos (*IG* XII.6.1 128), the outstanding relevance of which for the history of higher education has not been fully appreciated. In this inscription, the Peripatetic philosopher Epicrates is awarded citizenship by the Samians in recognition of his efforts for the local youth (véοι). This honorary decree, which I shall discuss further in Sec. 4 below, is the earliest inscription dedicated to a philosopher by a Greek political community specifically for his philosophical and didactic achievements, and not for political services, as often earlier.

Naturally, from the perspective of educational history, the third century is a period of transition. In many respects, both institutional and theoretical factors undergo gradual change and political and social consolidation.¹² But what is of special relevance for the present volume is that philosophy was able during this century to establish itself as part of general higher education alongside rhetoric, which had until then played the dominant role. In the long run, philosophy was even able to compete with rhetoric.¹³ Here, then, I shall first describe the main features of the social and political conditions of philosophizing, with particular emphasis on continuity with the fourth century. I shall then explain the importance of the honorary decree bestowed on Epicrates, before concluding with a brief look ahead at the second century.

¹¹ As Marrou (1938) first pointed out. But Marrou did not draw any conclusions for the social history of philosophizing, nor did he differentiate further the stages of development of higher intellectual education in Hellenistic times. On the archaeological monuments, see Schmidt (1991) 127–9, Zanker (1993) 218, Zanker (1995) 260–1. The gradual establishment of philosophical instruction can also be observed in some funeral epigrams and honorary decrees; see Wörle (1995) 248–50, *GVI* 764 = *GG* 134.

¹² Schmitt and Vogt (1988) 534–5. See also von den Hoff (1994) 35–41, Dihle (1987), Christes (1975) 23.

¹³ See the classic summary in von Arnim (1898) 4–114 (“Sophistik, Philosophie und Rhetorik in ihrem Kampf um die Jugendbildung”), esp. 76–87.

2.

As mentioned above, the political persecution of philosophers in Athens came to an end in 307 BCE. Yet the absence of reports about indictments for impiety (ἀσέβεια) or trials against philosophers does not mean the end of repressive actions. Furthermore, and this is a point to be stressed, it did not mark the end of their reputation as “eccentrics.”¹⁴ Even in Hellenistic times, education at home and in the gymnasium was basic and essential for preparing the young for their future tasks as citizens: for the roles of warrior, politician, and benefactor so far as their talents and resources would permit.¹⁵ The Greek ideal of the union of politician and citizen required a commitment to work for the welfare of one’s native town, as can be inferred from Aeschines (1.11) and many Hellenistic decrees. In the military sphere, the good citizen had to be able, for example, to help defend his town against the raids of robbers and pirates, as well as help in other military emergencies. Second, the good citizen had to be active in political and legal bodies, and also, if necessary, to carry out delicate diplomatic missions. Third, he had to make large financial contributions to his community when holding civic office, including the organization of feasts (ἀγωνοθεσία) and the supervision of local gymnasia (γυμνασιαρχία). Finally, he had to support his city by donations of grain or money if a shortage occurred.¹⁶

Accordingly, the urban elites still showed mixed feelings toward intellectual education. Most tolerated philosophy and rhetoric, and they held in high esteem the classes (σχολαί) and public lectures (ἐπιδείξεις), which provided the intellectual training necessary for political life. But fathers were unwilling to lose their sons to these arts, since they themselves had rejected the professional practice of philoso-

¹⁴ Cf. particularly the topos of philosophers’ ἀτοπία in comedy, proverbial at least since Aristophanes; see Weiher (1913) 5–37, Helm (1906) 371–86, Webster (1970) 50–6, 110–13, Gallo (1976) 206–42. The public perception of philosophers as “odd persons” corresponds with their characterisation as ἄδοξοι; see Scholz (1998) 45 and n. 125.

¹⁵ Cf. Gauthier (1995) 8. As the examination of funeral inscriptions has shown, no fundamental change in the hierarchy of social values took place in the third century. Instead of referring to a citizen’s main virtues, third-century inscriptions list his personal merits and contributions to his city; see Schmidt (1991) 132–9, Zanker (1995) 261.

¹⁶ The Hellenistic citizen, at least in theory, was anxious “to sap himself” by permanently serving his city; see Wörle (1995). Against the view of a decline in civic spirit in the Hellenistic period, see Gruen (1993) 339–54.

philizing. Even in the third century, the famous words which Callicles speaks in Plato's *Gorgias* were still valid: "Philosophy is a delightful thing, if someone touches it in moderation at the right time of life; but if he persists in it longer than he should, it is the ruin of men. For even if someone has an altogether good nature, but philosophizes beyond the right age, he is bound to end up inexperienced in all these things in which anyone who is to be a fine and good and respected man ought to have experience. . . . When I see an older man still philosophizing and not giving it up, I think he needs a beating. . . . For that person is bound to end up being unmanly."¹⁷

Instruction in rhetoric introduced young men to the formal techniques of speaking persuasively in political and legal settings, and it taught them the agonistic means of promoting their own interests. In schools of philosophy, on the other hand, they usually acquired dialectical skills and developed informed opinions on ethical problems.¹⁸ But the philosophical instruction established by Plato and Isocrates was limited to educating the young, and those who were seen spending too much time in the philosophers' gardens were considered completely inexperienced in practical matters. They acquired a reputation for not being useful to their friends (χρεία, ἑταιρία: Plat. *Rep.* 494E), and for lacking the kind of experience considered crucial for the male socialization that occupied the leisure of most wealthy youths. The kinds and extent of knowledge required for that was determined by social practice. Philosophizing was not allowed to keep young citizens from the demands of political and social life, from the social practice of the symposia, from athletic contests with friends at the gymnasia, from military training, or simply from fishing, riding, and hunting. If someone did decide to lead a philosophical life and closely followed a particular philosopher, he had to face mockery from his contemporaries

¹⁷ Plat. *Gorg.* 484C5–D2, 485D1–4 (trans. Irwin); cf. *Theaet.* 172D–177B, Isoc. *Panath.* 27–8, *Antid.* 265–8. For further evidence on this widespread attitude, see Dodds (1955) 272–3. *Gorg.* 485D4–E2 goes on to describe the unmanly seclusion of the philosopher: "unmanly, even if he has an altogether good nature; for he shuns the city center and the public squares where the poet says men win good reputations. He is sunk away out of sight for the rest of his life, and lives whispering with three or four boys in a corner, and never gives voice to anything fit for a free man, great and powerful." Plato contrasts the study of philosophy, which means having no other interest than educating a layman, with the practice of professional philosophizing; cf. Plat. *Prot.* 312B. Isoc. *Antid.* 261–9, *Panath.* 26–32, *Soph.* 7–8, Guthrie (1979) 309.

¹⁸ Cf. Marrou (1977) 375–400.

and the explicit or tacit contempt of his family.¹⁹ It is precisely this social context, the social rejection of professional philosophizing, that is taken for granted when Cleanthes (c. 310–230/29, scholar from 261) admonishes his pupils: “Do not attach any importance to your reputation, if you really strive to become a wise man, and do not be afraid of the talk of the people, which is usually without any judgment and impudent!”²⁰ He implies that the route to philosophical virtue is a long and stony path which requires great strength and effort, for the simple reason that philosophizing meant committing oneself to principles other than traditional political values and the demands of social practice, and because the price of “being an inglorious outsider” (ἀδοξία) was high.

Unfortunately, the only examples of the philosophical way of life we can investigate involve the philosophical scene in Athens. There it mainly manifested itself in voluntary isolation, in a physical and theoretical separation from politics that resulted from the decision to live an independent life according to philosophical principles. Thus, the leader of a school and his circle of closest students could spend nearly their entire life in a stable scholarly community. The leaders of the Academy in particular, Plato, Xenocrates, Polemon, and Arcesilaos, are said to have done just that.²¹

The decision to devote oneself to philosophy had far-reaching consequences for the conduct of one’s life. Most people found such a life peculiar, and the “strangeness” of philosophers — their ἀτοπία — became a popular cliché. Among the stereotypes were rigorous sexual abstinence but also sexual excess, ascetic exercises both physical and mental, admission of social inferiors like slaves and women into philosophical communities, a very slow and dignified gait, a serious facial expression with raised eyebrows, extravagant dress and appearance, ostentatious rejection of sensual pleasures, and renunciation of marriage and family.²² None of this was compatible with the conventional

¹⁹ Lloyd (1991) 136–7: “Greeks were careful to distinguish between learning an art for the sake of general education, and learning it in order to practise as a professional.”

²⁰ Clem. *Strom.* 5.3.17 = *SVF* 1.559: μὴ πρὸς δόξαν ὄρα, ἐθέλων σοφὸς αἶψα γενέσθαι, μηδὲ φοβοῦ πολλῶν ἄκριτον καὶ ἀναιδέα βᾶξιν. Cf. *SVF* 1.560–1, Plat. *Ap.* 31D–32A (Socrates justifies ἰδιωτεύειν, the retreat from political life).

²¹ D.L. 3.41 (Plato), 4.6, 11 (Xenocrates), 19 (Polemon), 39 (Arcesilaus). On this characteristic feature of theoretical life, see Scholz (1998) 21–5, esp. 21–2 n. 35.

²² Of the six Peripatetic scholarchs mentioned by Diogenes Laertius, only Aristotle

forms and manners of a citizen's life. Since philosophers cared little for honor (τιμή) and fame (δόξα), they did not participate in the usual military and athletic activities in gymnasia, for example, or in symposia and feasts, and they avoided politics and civic administration. This avoidance of ordinary social and political affairs is the main reason why many Athenians even in the Hellenistic period viewed philosophers as outsiders (ἄδοξοι).²³

The philosophical way of life developed autonomously, and it was organized in a distinctly individualistic and almost "anti-political" way. Their βίος distinguished philosophers both in theory and in practice from the sophists and rhetors who were their rivals in higher intellectual education. They fully accepted that their independence made them outsiders. Moreover, most of them were formally excluded from political activities since they lacked citizenship in the cities where they lived, and this was a further reason for their low social status. The Cynic Teles, whose diatribes attack and repudiate popular standards of social conduct, provides a telling example. The popular values he disparages are enumerated in his argumentation. Residence abroad (ξενία), for example, was considered a great social loss, whether it was voluntary or imposed as exile.²⁴

The idea of making a fortune abroad was no doubt unfamiliar to most citizens of the Hellenistic cities. Despite some famous exceptions, which became more frequent after 300 BCE, the hope of starting a new life successfully after exile and resettlement was restricted to a small social stratum, the ruling class of the urban elite and their families.²⁵ But this group was too small to produce any lasting change in popular attitudes toward foreigners and life abroad. The traditional ideal of

clearly had a wife and children (Nicomachus from his *pallake*, Pythias from his wife of the same name); see Sollenberger (1992) 3829.

²³ Cf. the similar views of Christes (1975) 39, 42, von den Hoff (1994) 26, 33, 39, Long (1993) 150, 163. For ordinary people's resentments of philosophers, see the anonymous *Life of Aesop*, usually not cited in scholarship; cf. Hägg (1997) 192–3.

²⁴ Teles 21 Hense, from the treatise *Περὶ φυγῆς*. On this passage, see Fuentes González (1998) 284–8; cf. O'Neil (1977) 78–84, Seibert (1979) 360–3, 600. On Teles, see Habicht (1992) 248–50, Goulet-Cazé (1981) 166–72. See also Teles 23 Hense, which reflects public opinion about exiles and refugees (φυγάδες): οὐκ ἄρχουσιν, φασίν, οὐ πιστεύονται, οὐ παρρησίαν ἔχουσιν. For further references, see Fuentes González (1998) 298–9.

²⁵ Cf. Habicht (1958) 1–16, esp. 8–9.

spending all of one's life in one's ancestral homeland was still alive in Hellenistic times. Most who had this privilege gladly exercised it, and it was considered a "disgrace" (ὄνειδος) to be buried in foreign soil.²⁶

Athenian citizens expected foreign visitors to leave Athens soon after completing the education which had brought them there: students after finishing their study of rhetoric or philosophy in the gymnasia, and scholars after giving their courses or public lectures. That at least was the normal practice. It should be remembered that Plato and Epicurus were able to purchase private property only because of their citizen status. The Peripatos, which did not have an Athenian citizen as director initially, was indebted to Demetrius of Phalerum for its property. As a former student of Aristotle's, he made a generous donation to his follower, Theophrastus, so that the estate would thereafter remain part of the school's property.²⁷

Given our relatively detailed information about the philosophical schools in Athens, we tend to forget that the philosophical way of life there may not reflect the normal conditions of philosophizing. Many philosophers traveled around the Greek world as wandering scholars.²⁸ Their way of life became conspicuous and scandalous only when some of them settled down as resident foreigners and began to gather students around them. It is not surprising, therefore, that philosophers, whether as founders of schools of their own or as wandering scholars, generally preferred to stay in large cities. Surely they learned by experience that the smaller the city they visited, the more closely their conduct and way of life would be scrutinized.²⁹

²⁶ Teles 29–30 Hense; cf. Fuentes González (1998) 345–50 (on this passage), D.L. 2.11. The label "metic" never appears in Attic honorary decrees, even when an honorand is readily identified as one by his *ethnikon* and the kind of his benefactions; see Whitehead (1977) 30.

²⁷ Scholz (1998) 15–24.

²⁸ For this phenomenon, see Wilamowitz (1881) 312–13, Ziebarth (1914) 60, 122–3, Guarducci (1927/9) 629–55, Schneider (1967–69) vol. 1 142, Bouvier (1995) 119–35, Marek (1984) 210–13 (Delphi), 265–7 (Delos), Chaniotis (1988) 365–72, Wacker (1996) 134–7. This contrasts with the members of philosophical schools in Megara, Elis, and Eretria, whose scholarchs evidently taught almost exclusively in one place. The social status of Hellenistic scholars has been disputed by Christes (1975) 57–71.

²⁹ Teles 50 Hense mentions the strict supervision of the gymnasiarch. Although his point is surely somewhat exaggerated, it seems a correct description of the gymnasiarch's responsibilities; cf. Plat. Ax. 366D–367A. The strictness of gymnasiarchs (ἀϋστηρότης, ἀϋστηρία) is sometimes emphasized in honorary decrees: Hepding (1907) 273–8 no. 10, 278–84 no. 11, Jacobsthal (1908) 379–81 no. 2, all from Pergamon.

As a result, Athens and Rhodes were almost ideal places for philosophical life and work. As well established centers of trade and commerce, they were rich and powerful, and they offered a range of favourable conditions which wandering scholars could not find in smaller cities. In each, many foreign traders had settled with their families and founded businesses as well as new cults and associations. In so doing, they made significant contributions both to the prosperity and to the social and religious diversity of each city, which in turn led to the establishment of special legal and political forms for foreigners. Their prosperity and social success also enabled them to build and maintain several large and splendid gymnasia. Furthermore, each city's role as a center of maritime trade in the Eastern Mediterranean made it possible both for the theories taught there to spread more readily throughout the Greek world, and for philosophers to meet other itinerant scholars. Thanks to numerous travelers and tourists, it was also easier to recruit students there.³⁰

Nevertheless, it was rare for a city in the third century to actively support intellectual education, even in primary schools. For understandable reasons, Athens and Rhodes made no effort in this area. They simply did not need any special incentives to attract teachers, rhetors, or scholars of any kind. Public support was evidently left to smaller cities like Lampsacus, whose citizens decreed, at an unknown date in the third century, an exemption from all taxes for all "teachers" (διδάσκαλοι) and "students" (μαθηταί) who stayed in the city for educational purposes.³¹ But this measure can hardly be interpreted as an act of

Cf. also an interesting fragment of Philodemus (from Book 2 of *Περὶ Ἐπικούρου*) F 6 col. 2.9–12 (p. 59 Vogliano), which claims that Epicurus, neither "through the power of the mob nor of a monarch nor of a gymnasiarch" (ὕπ' ἐξουσίας ὄχλων ἢ μοναρχοῦντος ἢ γυμνασιαρχοῦντος ἀνδρός) let himself be carried away into taking revenge; however the passage is to be interpreted on other points, it clearly testifies that this magistrate's task was to supervise the gymnasium strictly. See also De Witt (1954) 71: "The Greek city-states assumed very limited responsibility for furnishing education, but they took somewhat seriously the responsibility for supervising it"; Lynch (1972) 131 provides a similar view and cites Aeschin. *Tim.* 12: "The philosophers had to avoid conflict with the functions which were supervised by the gymnasiarchs or officially sponsored by the city."

³⁰ On the origins and itineraries of wandering historians, see Chaniotis (1988) 365–89, esp. 377–82; cf. Schneider (1967–69) vol. 2 206–7. Athens, Pergamon, and Rhodes were the cultural metropolises of the Greek world, whereas cities like Cyzicus, Samos, and Lampsacus must be considered local educational centres; see Gauthier (1995) 5.

³¹ See the exemption from salt tax for all διδάσκαλοι τῶν γραμμάτων καὶ τοὺς

“Kulturpolitik” intended to enhance the image of the city, given what we know about similiar privileges granted later. Rather, we must infer that the purpose of such measures was to increase the number of teachers available for private education paid for by families.³²

We know of no city that actively supported any kind of intellectual education in the third century. Other resources were also missing. There were still no public libraries, not even small collections of book-scrolls for philosophers or rhetors to use for their lessons in the gymnasia. As a result, they probably had to use scrolls from their own or other private collections.³³ This clearly shows that intellectual training, including both rhetoric and philosophy, was still seen as an exclusive and private pleasure of the wealthy leisure-class, as it had always been.

παιδοτρίβας and their descendants by order of Ptolemy II Philadelphus in *P. Hal.* 1.260–1. Cf. *IvLampsakos* 8.1–4: [? τῶν] ἄλλων ξένων τελούντων τὴν σύνταλξιν τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς [πόλεως] ἀτελεῖς εἶναι τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ διδασκάλους οἱ ἐνδημοῦσιν ἢ ἐνδημήσουσιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν παιδεύοντες ἢ παιδευθησόμενοι. Here, the general term “teacher” is employed, which refers to all kinds of teachers (διδάσκαλοι), including philosophers as well as “teachers of fencing.” This is shown (for example) by a Thespian decree from the mid-third century honoring the Athenian Sostratus, a professional instructor in arms: Roesch (1982) 307.9–15. Cf. *Aen. Tact.* 10.10, advising readers in the event of war, τοὺς κατὰ παιδευσιν ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ χρεῖαν ἐπιδημοῦντας ἀπογράφεσθαι; even this early text takes it for granted that foreign teachers and scholars staying for educational purposes were resident in most cities of any size which had a gymnasium.

³² On the question of state encouragement of intellectual education in the Greek cities, see Ziebarth (1914) 30–6. The existence of a *paidonomos* in some cities is not equivalent to public support of elementary schools. That intellectual instruction was privately financed is suggested by the so-called funeral monument of a Rhodian teacher who γράμματ’ ἐδίδαξεν ἔτεα πεν[τήκ]ον[θ’ ὅδε] | δύο (*GVI* 1916.1–2). It is remarkable that the tomb or *temenos* was financed not publicly but by former students who remembered their boyhood and felt indebted to him. Here I take issue with Ziebarth (1914) 39–40, who does not clearly distinguish between general and intellectual *paideia*.

³³ The first attested and securely dated public libraries accessible for everyone and financed from public funds are those of Pergamon (Strabo 13.4.2). Strabo mentions not only one but several βιβλιοθήκαι, which were clearly administrated as a unit. The epigraphic evidence seems to confirm this: for Pergamon, Jacobsthal (1908) 383 no. 4.7–10, 409 no. 41, *Plut. Ant.* 58.9; for Rhodes, *I.Rhod.* 11 (Maiuri), Segre (1935) 214–22, Papachristodoulou (1988–90) 500–1. Other references to public libraries, both literary (Maron’s in Antioch, c. 150 BCE; one in Smyrna, second century?) and epigraphic (within the Ptolemaeum gymnasium in Athens, attested since 117/6 BCE; Taormina, second century; Teos, second/first century; Mylasa, Nysa, and Delphi, first century) first appeared in the second century BCE. For details, see Scholz (2004) 125–8.

A brief look at the donations to schools confirms this. The earliest documents are mostly from the second century. I need only mention the famous donations of Eudemus in Miletus (200/199), Polythrus in Teos (around 200), Eumenes II of Pergamon in Rhodes (161/160), and his brother Attalos II in Delphi (160/159).³⁴ But when all the relevant documents are taken together, they still support the hypothesis that these donations funded only the foundation of a public system of elementary schools, or the system of education found in nearly every Hellenistic city in the Greek world. In my opinion, they are nothing more than especially impressive examples of private euergetism, since they occurred only rarely and sporadically, and evidently not after the Mithradatic wars.³⁵ This impression is further confirmed by the fact that rhetors, historians, philosophers, and other scholars rarely visited a local gymnasium, and usually at the initiative of its supervisors who themselves had a special interest in intellectual education (φιλομαθία). Lectures in this context were mainly the result of special invitation, and I would be reluctant to interpret such events as indicating a need for education articulated and supported by citizens more broadly.³⁶

To sum up briefly, since cities did not attempt to promote intellectual education effectively on a personal or institutional level, we may infer that the popularization of philosophical and rhetorical education was limited, and supported almost solely by the urban elites alone. This is not surprising if we look at the sophisticated sepulchral epigrams and grave monuments decorated with sculptural work. From the fourth century on, we have sporadic examples which praise the deceased as “educated” (πεπαιδευμένος) by depicting him with the distinctive attributes of higher education. It is clear that the exclusivity of an education in philosophy or rhetoric, and the financial effort it required, led elite society to distinguish the “educated” from the “uneducated” (ἀπαιδευτοί

³⁴ Syll.³ 577 (Eudemus of Miletus) = Ziebarth (1914); Syll.³ 578 (Polythrus of Teos); Polyb. 31.31.1–3 = Bringmann and von Steuben (1995) no. 212 [L] (Eumenes II); Syll.³ 672 = Bringmann and von Steuben (1995) no. 94 [E] (Delphi).

³⁵ Harris (1989) 146; cf. Weber (1993) 154–64. On the various burdens on Eastern Greek cities caused by local wars, piracy, encroachments by *proconsules* and *publicani*, and finally through the Roman civil war in the second and first centuries, see Quass (1993) 124–32, 135–7, 203–4, 234, 251–2. Cf. Cicero’s description of the cities in the province Asia as *urbes complures dirutas ac paene desertas* (*Ep. Q. fr.* 1.25).

³⁶ See n. 48–50 below.

or ἄγροικοι).³⁷ Clearly, intellectual *paideia* became an important criterion of social differentiation for the ruling elite and others alike.³⁸

3.

In the third century, philosophical *paideia* became increasingly important for the education of the ruling elite. This was due not only to its methods of subtle argument but also to its impact on social cultivation. In particular, its ability to shape a student's ethos or character contrasted with the role of rhetoric, which lost its dominant role because it failed to meet to such needs.³⁹ The urban elites had new expectations for philosophical teaching. Ideally, the study of philosophy should be general and equip young men with rhetorical techniques as well as skill in dialectic, historical knowledge, and ethical standards. Plutarch reports that the Achaean general Philopoemen (253–183) “listened even to lectures by philosophers and read their works, not all but only those which could have a lasting effect on ethical conduct” (*Philop.* 4.6–8).⁴⁰

Even our limited evidence for the education and intellectual background of leading politicians in the third century shows a clear increase in the philosophical component in higher intellectual education. For example, Abantidas, tyrant of Sicyon 264–252, was not afraid to display his intellectual education in public. He did this by “attending” the public discourses of the otherwise unknown teacher Deinias and the dialectician Aristotle “in the marketplace and he used to argue with them.”⁴¹ Ecdemus and Demophanes, two leading politicians in Megalopolis, had no doubt enjoyed a similar education; they took the opportunity offered by several years in exile to deepen their knowledge of

³⁷ Cf. for example Diod. 1.2.5–6.

³⁸ Kleijwegt (1991) 84–6, Schmidt (1991) 128–9, cf. Habicht (1958) 7–8.

³⁹ Not one conflict between rhetors and philosophers is attested in the third century, which suggests that the importance of rhetoric in intellectual education was in decline. For this view, see von Arnim (1898) 81, cf. P. Steinmetz in Schmitt and Vogt (1988) 534–6, F. Kühnert in 597–604.

⁴⁰ Plut. *Philop.* 4.6: ἡκροῶτο δὲ λόγων καὶ συγγράμμασι φιλοσόφων ἐνετύγχανεν, οὐ πᾶσι ἀλλ’ ὅφ’ ὧν ἐδόκει πρὸς ἀρετὴν ὠφελεῖσθαι. On Philopoemen's youth, see Errington (1969) 13–26.

⁴¹ Plut. *Arat.* 3.4: εἰωθότα τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῶν κατ’ ἀγορὰν σχολάζοντων ἐκάστοτε παρεῖναι καὶ συμφιλονικεῖν. On the tyranny of Abantidas, who was murdered at just such a meeting (διατριβή) in 252, see Skalet (1928) 83, Berve (1967) vol. 1 394. The Deinias mentioned above could be the local historian of the same name from Argos; see Jacoby, *Kommentar on FGrH* 306, 25–6 with notes.

philosophy by joining the circle of Arcesilaus (268/4–244/3).⁴² We should also remember the well-known fact that many sons of Hellenistic kings attended lessons by various philosophers.⁴³

As these examples show, those who sought to belong to the ruling classes of the Hellenistic world had to have an education in keeping with his social status. To acquire this education, the sons of affluent citizens typically went to the nearest city that had both a gymnasium and an adequate number of teachers, such as Samos, Lampsacus, Colophon, or Miletus. These cities, in contrast to Athens and Rhodes, I would call local centers of intellectual education. Families which had more financial resources available for education sent their sons to one of the metropolitan centers of higher intellectual education, where they found not only multiple gymnasia but also rhetors, philosophers, and scholars of many kinds.⁴⁴ In a travelogue written sometime after 230 BCE, Heracleides describes the gymnasia of Athens as attractive places for study, “planted with trees and provided with lawns”; these and many other cultural attractions — “the manifold feasts, seductions of the soul, and relaxation with philosophers of every kind, an abundance of lectures, dramas without interruption” — made Athens a place suitable for all rich and educated to develop their intellectual abilities and increase their knowledge in all fields of learning.⁴⁵

Rhodes, with its concentration of many educational attractions and entertainments, was also a cultural center of the third-century Greek world.⁴⁶ Elisabetta Matelli, in ch. 4, shows in detail the importance of

⁴² Plut. *Philop.* 1.3–4. On these two educated politicians, see Berve (1967) vol. 1 394–5, Sonnabend (1996) 264–71.

⁴³ D.L. 2.141 on Menedemus and Antigonos II Gonatas (ἡγάπα δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Ἀντίγονος καὶ μαθητὴν ἀνεκήρυττεν), 5.58 on Strato of Lampsacus teaching Ptolemy II Philadelphus (καθηγήσατο Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου καὶ ἔλαβε . . . παρ’ αὐτοῦ τάλαντα ὀγδοήκοντα), 7.13 on Zeno, Persaeus, and Antigonos II Gonatas, 7.169 on Cleanthes receiving a huge gift of money, and Plut. *Cleom.* 2 on Cleomenes attending lectures by Sphaerus.

⁴⁴ The classic case is the Lyceum, where rhapsodes, sophists, and rhetors could usually be found: D.L. 9.54, Isoc. *Panath.* 18–20, 33 (from 340 BCE).

⁴⁵ Heracl. Cret. 1.1 Pfister. On this treatise, see most recently Fittschen (1995) 55–60, 89, Perrin (1994) 192–202. For the four Athenian *gymnasia* (Academia, Cynosarges, Lyceum, Ptolemaeum), see the recent archeological-historical study by Wacker (1996) 145–78.

⁴⁶ Numerous poets and scholars came from Rhodes (see the lists in van Gelder [1900] 409–22 and now Mygind [1999]), but also many Olympic victors (Schneider [1967–9] vol. 2 191–2). See the general remarks in Fabricius (1999) 222–4, Bringmann

Rhodes for philosophy and other studies. I would only add to her account two anecdotes in which Aristippus of Cyrene and Bion of Borysthenes appear as wandering scholars.⁴⁷ To the best of my knowledge, these are the only cases in the literary tradition that deal with the phenomenon of wandering philosophers in Hellenistic times. Significantly, both take place in the gymnasium of Rhodes, and in my opinion that is no coincidence.

The role of intellectual education as an instrument of social distinction for the upper classes (which marked them off from the mass of “uneducated” citizens and barbarians) was only one factor that ensured that philosophy and other intellectual training was first integrated into general education and then spread during the third and second centuries from the center to the periphery of the Greek *oikoumene*. On an institutional level, the gymnasiarchs in small and medium-sized cities also made a major contribution to this development.⁴⁸ As representatives of the social elite in their cities, these magistrates initiated, organized, and supported both brief visits and longer stays by philosophers and other scholars in the local gymnasia. This entailed using their own funds to reimburse the lecturers, taking care of them in every respect, ensuring a warm reception from the public at the gymnasia, and introducing them to the city’s leading families.⁴⁹

But again, caution is necessary. It is striking that the merits of supervisors of gymnasia in the intellectual fields are usually recorded in a mere sentence or two in decrees preserved from the second century.

(2002). Two reports on Bion’s visit (or visits?) to the island (D.L. 4.49 = F 4 Kindstrand, D.L. 4.53 = T 3 Kindstrand) and a report that the rhetor Aeschines opened a rhetorical school during his Rhodian exile ([Plut.] *Vit. X or.* 6 840D: ἀπάρας εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον, ἐνταῦθα σχολὴν καταστήσάμενος ἐδίδασκεν, cf. Kunst [1917]) indicate that Rhodes must have been a center for intellectual education already in the third century.

⁴⁷ D.L. 4.53 = Bion T 3 Kindstrand (πόλιν ἐκ πόλεως ἤμειβεν); *Vitr.* 6 praef. 1 = Aristippus SSR 4 A 50. Like the sophists, Bion’s travels and lecturing was reportedly for financial gain (πολυτέλεια); cf. *Plat. Soph.* 224B (οὐκοῦν καὶ τὸν μαθήματα ξυνωνούμενον πόλιν τε ἐκ πόλεως νομίματος ἀμείβοντα ταῦτὸν προσερεῖς ὄνομα), *Pol.* 289E (οἱ δὲ πόλιν ἐκ πόλεως ἀλλάττοντες).

⁴⁸ In this context it should be pointed out that Lycurgus was probably able to persuade Aristotle and Theophrastus to return to Athens in 335 BCE by his generous offer to put at their disposal part of the Lyceum gymnasium, recently built at his own expense; Scholz (1998) 175–6.

⁴⁹ The warm reception accorded to lecturers by gymnasiarchs is stressed several times; see, for example, a decree from Pergamon honoring the gymnasiarch Agias (before 133 BCE): Jacobsthal (1908) 380 no. 2.13–17.

This seems to me typical for the general estimation of philosophy and other studies. In an honorary decree bestowed on Menas of Sestos (between 133 and 122 BCE), for example, there is only a brief reference to his accomplishments on behalf of the intellectual *paideia* of his fellow citizens. As the decree points out, the foreigners who enjoyed his generosity included some wandering scholars: “He showed his generosity also towards all those who held lectures since he intended to help make his father-city famous also in these ways for its cultivated and educated men [διὰ τῶν πεπαιδευμένοι].”⁵⁰

4.

The honorary decree for Epicrates of Heraclea is an impressive document which shows a philosopher as a wandering scholar at work.⁵¹ The great importance of this inscription for the history of intellectual education only becomes apparent when we take into account all currently known evidence for honors conferred on philosophers. Since my space is limited, I shall offer only some general conclusions based on the epigraphical evidence for honors bestowed on Peripatetics during the fourth and third centuries. Aristotle, Callisthenes, Clearchus, Praxiphanes, Lyco, and Prytanis were honored by the citizens of Delphi,

⁵⁰ *OGIS* 339.74–6 = *IK* 19 Sestos 1.74–6: προσηνέχθη δὲ φιλανθρώπως καὶ τοῖς ἀκροάσει[ς] | ποιησαμένοις πᾶσιν, βουλόμενος καὶ ἐν τούτοις διὰ τῶν πεπαιδευμένων τὸ ἔνδοξον π[ε]ριτιθέναι τῇ πατρίδι. Cf. Jacobsthal (1908) 380 no. 2.19–21: the gymnasiarch Agias is praised by the people of Pergamon because he raised the teachers’ salaries ὅπως φιλοτιμότερον πρὸς τῇ παιδείᾳ γινομένων αὐτῶν τῆς μεγίστης ὠφελίας οἱ φιλομαθοῦντες τυγχάνωσιν καὶ τὸ τῆς πόλεως ἔνδοξον διαφυλάσσεται.

⁵¹ *IG* XII.6.1 128 = Schede (1919) no. 14 = *SEG* 1.368. Guarducci (1927/9) lists only five decrees from the third century honoring historians, teachers of grammar or literature, or philosophers for their educational activities in the cities’ gymnasia: the earliest is for the rhetor and historian Neanthes of Cyzicus, granted the proxeny by Delphi in 287 (*FD* 1.429 = *FGrH* 84 T 2); for the Peripatetic Praxiphanes c. 260–50 (*IG* XI.4 613); for the scholar of the Peripatos, Lyco of Troas in 240s (*Syll.*³ 461 = 6 SFOD); for the historian Mnesiptolemos of Cyme, honored c. 200 on Delos with the proxeny for his historical work (*IG* XI.4 697 = *FGrH* 164 T 3); and for the Peripatetic Epicrates on Samos c. 200 (*IG* XII.6.1 128). Chaniotis (1988) lists a few more wandering scholars honored by the cities during the third century: an anonymous historian in Amphipolis (E 6 Chaniotis = *SEG* 28.534) and his colleague Themistocles, son of Aeschylus, of Ilion, who was granted the proxeny in Xanthos in 196 (E 12 Chaniotis = Robert and Robert [1983] 154–5). Three examples from the second and first centuries (E 17–19 Chaniotis) provide a more detailed view of the circumstances of their visits and lectures.

Ai-Khanoum, Delos, and Athens. But none was honored specifically for their philosophical activities.⁵² All except Prytanis were honored abroad, by neither their native cities nor their new homes (Athens or Rhodes) where they spent their lives. Their honors were bestowed for specific acts, mostly in politics or diplomacy. Yet their political deeds were not important enough to make philosophers popular.⁵³

This impression based on evidence for the Peripatetics is confirmed by a thorough examination of the sources recording public honors conferred on members of other philosophical schools in the third century.⁵⁴ The Samian decree honoring Epicrates deserves closer examination against this background. In commenting on it and especially the crucial passage in lines 11–28 (with supplements in brackets), I shall point out some of the typical conditions of philosophizing in the third century.

Epicrates, son of Demetrius, of Heracle-
[a], a Peripatetic, has for a long time
[stay]ed in our city
[and through] his intellectual education in many respects
15 he has much benefited [the] young men; for, he

⁵² Aristotle and Callisthenes: *Syll.*³ 252.42 (327/6 in Delphi), cf. Scholz (1998) 178–9; Clearchus (c. 300 in Ai-Khanoum): Robert (1973) 211, 225–30; Praxiphanes (c. 260–50 in Delos): *IG* XI.4 613 = F 4 Wehrli, cf. Scholz (1998) 190 n. 19; Lyco (between 249–39 in Delphi): *Syll.*³ 461 = 6 SFOD, cf. Scholz (1998) 191–2; Prytanis (226/5 in Athens): Merritt (1935) 525–9 = Moretti (1967) no. 28, cf. Sonnabend (1996) 247–9, 280–3. See the works cited in n. 28 above.

⁵³ The popularity Theophrastus reportedly enjoyed in Athens (D.L. 5.37) is in my opinion an invention of D.L. or a Hellenistic biographical writer; the report reaches its climax in a section that describes a large crowd at his funeral; cf. Regenbogen (1940) 1360. D.L. 5.66 = Lyco 1.26–7 SFOD, on Lyco's political services to the city, is also formulated in very general terms, which raises doubts about its credibility; the claim seems to be a defense of the Peripatetic scholar against accusations of political inactivity. The purported popularity of the two Academic scholars Arcesilaus (D.L. 4.44 = T 1a Mette) and Lacydes (Euseb. *PE* 14.7.1 = T 3 Mette) points in the same direction; no significant services to Athens which might establish such an extraordinary public reputation are attested for them, nor is there any such evidence for Lyco or Theophrastus. Cf. the far-fetched story in D.L. 10.19 claiming that Epicurus was honored with twenty statues in his lifetime.

⁵⁴ On the circumstances of the decree honoring Zeno the Stoic, which was probably initiated by Antigonos Gonatas, see Scholz (1998) 320–2, following Ferguson (1911) 187. The Macedonian king seems to have engaged his Athenian confidant, Thrason of Anakaia, to put forward the proposal; hence, the decision to honor Zeno should not be interpreted as reflecting the attitude of the Athenian people toward the founder of the Stoa.

- [wan]ted to help in private life all
 colleagues in study who ca[me to him], and
 [in pub]lic all people. He gave them both generous
 access to his (philosophical) education by
 20 teaching every citizen who [wan]ted to join, and even
 those f[e]llows who were [not] able to pay
 [the] fee fixed by him, free of charge.
 So that we also are making clear that
 [we] honour the good and worthy men
 25 who are able to be of use to all young men
 eager for knowledge, both to those who have wealt[h]
 as well as to those who are lacking livelihood,
 [it is decreed] by the people: . . .

The inscription is dated to around 200 BCE on the basis of the lettering style. If this is correct, Epicrates of Heraclea, who is otherwise unknown, must have been a student of Lyco (who died in 226/5 or 225/4) and probably a contemporary of Aristo of Ceos, who succeeded Lyco as head of the Peripatos.⁵⁵ He was probably born about 250. After his name, patronym, and demotic, he is referred to in the inscription as a “Peripatetic” (περιπατητικός), and not, as Lyco is in the list of donors for an *epidosis* from 229, as a “philosopher” (φιλόσοφος).⁵⁶ It is remarkable that his membership in the Peripatos is stressed here, and we can probably exclude the possibility that he is to be identified with one of the philologists from the Alexandrian “mouseion”, who are also called “Peripatetics.” The term “colleagues in study” (συσχολάζοντες) used here in line 17 also appears in the last wills of the heads of the Peripatos preserved by Diogenes Laertius, where it refers specifically to the inner circle of the head of the school and his associates. In other words, the term here indicates a close-knit group of students — an αἵρεσις — who accompanied Epicrates.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ On the chronology of the scholarchs, see Dorandi (1991) 68–9, cf. Zumpt (1843) 65–6. For the political history of Samos at the end of the third and the beginning of the second century, see Transier (1985) 29–35, Shipley (1987) 190–201. Throughout the third century, Samos apparently enjoyed a golden age in higher culture, as the many famous artists, poets, historians, and scholars from there suggests; see Shipley 226–7.

⁵⁶ *IG* II² 791 = Lyco 5 SFOD. On the reasons for this *epidosis*, see Habicht (1982) 26–8. The members of Aristotle’s school were known either as οἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ περιπάτου or περιπατητικοί; see Busse (1926).

⁵⁷ Cf. D.L. 5.52, from Theophrastus’ will: τὸν δὲ κήπον καὶ τὸν περίπατον καὶ τὰς οἰκίας τὰς πρὸς τῷ κήπῳ πάσας δίδωμι τῶν γεγραμμένων φίλων αἰεὶ τοῖς

The literary evidence makes it clear that a wandering philosopher normally traveled not on his own but together with his followers, as the anecdote about Bion of Borysthene mentioned above vividly testifies.⁵⁸ Bion lacked a tight circle of students escorting him which he could proudly present to the public audience in the gymnasium in Rhodes. He solved this problem by persuading some sailors to wear “school clothes” (σχολαστικὰς ἐσθῆτας) and then passed them off as his students. Whether or not this story is true, it shows that the curiosity and interest of those in the gymnasia would increase considerably when a philosopher marched into the palaestra accompanied by a group of students.

In the private sphere, Epicrates appears as a teacher, or rather as a charismatic leader of a group of Peripatetics. As such he is expected to care for his companions like a father, “to oblige or help them” (χαρίζεσθαι, 15–16).⁵⁹ He had to ensure their physical and mental welfare, perhaps in the way reported of Aristippus. After he was shipwrecked, he went to the gymnasium in Rhodes and impressed the audience there so much with his philosophical discussions that they showered him with gifts of money. As a result, he could afford not only

βουλομένοις συσχολάζειν καὶ συμφιλοσοφεῖν ἐν αὐταῖς. D.L. 5.2 (from Hermippus' *Lives*) reports that Aristotle ἐλέσθαι περίπατον τὸν ἐν Λυκείῳ καὶ . . . τοῖς μαθηταῖς συμφιλοσοφεῖν. Epicurus also called the members of his garden community συμφιλοσοφούντες (in his will: D.L. 10.16–21), as distinct from οἱ τῶν ἔξωθεν (*PHerc.* 1232 F 8 col. 1.7–9). See also the anonymous *Life of Aesop* 22–4, where the philosopher Xanthus, who had studied in Athens under philosophers, rhetors, and philologists (36), is accompanied by rich students (σχολαστικοί) coming from Greece and the islands (20): Ξάνθος . . . ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐκεῖ οἰκεῖ καὶ πολλοὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ τῶν νήσων πρὸς αὐτὸν φοιτῶσιν ἐν εὐπορίᾳ ὄντες. On this story, see Hägg (1997).

⁵⁸D.L. 4.53 = Bion T 3 Kindstrand. The sailors probably wore only a chiton (χιτὼν), which they exchanged for an old cloak (τρίβων). The Cynics wore these cloaks in a distinctive way, leaving one shoulder bare: Kindstrand (1976) 137, 162. The anecdote is not meant to show that Bion managed to get even sailors to study philosophy. Rather, his provocative entry was intended to attract the attention of the audience at the Rhodian gymnasium, as Kindstrand (1976) 138–9 rightly notes. On this episode, see also Radermacher (1947) 120–1. In this context, it is important to note that Bion could have been invited by Hieronymus or Arideices in order to τὰ φιλοσοφούμενα διδάσκειν, as stated in D.L. 4.49 = F 4 Kindstrand. The three philosophers not only were contemporaries but also must have studied in Athens in the same schools at the same time. On the influence of Peripatetic teaching on Bion's thought, see Kindstrand (1976) 70–8.

⁵⁹Cf. the practice of Epicurean communities, which supported one other and shared all the necessities of life within their circle of friends; see Scholz (1998) 302–3.

“to provide himself with clothes, but also his companions, and even to pay them their living costs” (Vitr. 6 praef. 1).⁶⁰

The vague phrasing makes it hard to tell how long Epicrates and his συσκολάζοντες stayed in Samos. It must have been at least several months, if not a full year or more; otherwise there would have been too little time for an intensive philosophical education. Besides holding discussions with his inner circle of close students (σχολαί), he was also active in public education as a teacher of *paideia* in the philosophical sense, as stated in line 19: ἡ παιδεία καθ’ αὐτόν.⁶¹ This expression is a clear reference to the distinctive Academic and Peripatetic conception of philosophy as a complement to the normal physical, musical, or rhetorical training, which it sought to complete rather than oppose.⁶² According to this view, philosophical instruction was the capstone of the program of higher education for free-born men. That implies that the young citizens of Samos who were Epicrates’ audience had finished the ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία based on rhetoric and sophistics, and that the technical, literary, and historical knowledge they had already acquired —

⁶⁰ Vitr. 6 praef. 1 = Aristippus 1 A 43 Giannantoni. On Aristippus, who visited Athens, Megara, Asia Minor, Rhodes, Scillus, Aegina, and Syracuse during his life of wandering, see Antoniadis (1916) 15–18. On his teachings, see Döring (1988).

⁶¹ Cf. the Peripatetic account of the effect of philosophical *paideia*: δοκεῖ ... ἡ παιδεία ... ἡμεροῦν τὰς ψυχὰς ... τὰ ἤθη καινότερα καὶ ὑγρότερα γίνεται (Stob. 2.31.124); τῇν παιδείαν εἶναι ἱερὸν ἄσυλον (Stob. 2.13.140 = Lyco 16 SFOD). The Peripatos tried to clarify for its external audience the difference between educated and uneducated conduct (παιδεία and ἀπαιδευσία) by compiling collections of definitions, sayings, maxims, and anecdotes, all designed to show what kinds of ethical orientation should be considered good or bad. Cf. the Epicurean Metrodorus’ view limiting the task of philosophy to discussing the right form of life (which helps people overcome fear) and how to live a happy life (Plut. *Adv. Col.* 34 1127C = F 32 Körte). Cf. the Stoic Sphaerus teaching in Sparta: λέγεται δὲ καὶ λόγων φιλοσόφων τὸν Κλεομένη μετασχεῖν ἔτι μειράκιον ὄντα, Σφαίρου τοῦ Βορυσθενίτου παραλαβόντος εἰς τὴν Λακεδαιμόνα καὶ περὶ τοὺς νέους καὶ τοὺς ἐφήβους οὐκ ἀμελῶς διατρέβοντος (Plut. *Cleom.* 2).

⁶² The Academy required completion of the ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία before starting the study of philosophy (Xenocrates in D.L. 4.10, Crantor in Stob. 2.31.27 = F 14a Mette). The Peripatos also approved of this propaedeutic study, and convinced of the ennobling effect of philosophical *paideia*, it sought to transform the traditional form of “Polis-Moral” into cosmopolitan humanistic ethics; see Scholz (1998) 212–21, 246–9. Many philosophers of the third century (including Aristippus, Zeno, Aristo of Chios, Epicurus, Sceptics) refused to accept the conventional form of education; see Kühnert (1961) 99–105. Chrysippus was the first Stoic to approve τὰ ἐγκύκλια μαθήματα (D.L. 7.129 = SVF 3.738).

known as πολυμαθία — was then broadened and polished with the art of knowing how to lead one's life, which is often referred to as τέχνη περὶ τὸν βίον.⁶³

Philosophical *paideia* required substantial financial resources to cover travel overseas, fees for multiple teachers, and expenses for food, service, bed, clothes, and other equipment. Such resources were available only to a small minority of citizens.⁶⁴ Most could not afford even the relatively inexpensive intellectual education available in the local gymnasia, as the Epicrates decree clearly shows. Accordingly, Epicrates' private and public activities are singled out in the decree for high praise as an extraordinary act of euergetism; and the decree even emphasizes that during his stay the philosopher cancelled his fees for those young men who were eager for instruction but unable to pay for such an exclusive education. In this respect, the honorary decree for Epicrates also reveals how much the need for higher intellectual education and for cultivated speech and conversation had grown among the Greek middle classes by the beginning of the second century. The main reason, in my view, is that the Greeks felt that cultural identity was closely connected with a philosophical-rhetorical education, and that this was one of the main distinctions between them and uneducated barbarian peoples.⁶⁵

The only pictorial evidence from Hellenistic times of philosophical *paideia in actu* is a Rhodian marble relief, and it refers at least implicitly to the use of philosophical knowledge and education.⁶⁶ Two short

⁶³ Cf. Christes (1975) 23, Dihle (1987) 194, Hahn (1989) 39.

⁶⁴ Stob. 2.31.124 (Theophrastus F 465 FHS&G) names two material preconditions for philosophical study: both a βίος ἐλευθέριος and a sufficient fortune. Cf. Teles 40 and 46 Hense. The two references clearly show that financial independence was indispensable for study in Athens, which lasted at least two years. The Peripatetics in particular led a lavish life of luxury; their fashionable, even flamboyant, and expensive clothing, as well as their opulent *syssitia*, were well known in Athens (Ath. 12.547D–548B = Lyco 8 SFOD).

⁶⁵ Cf. the praise of the Greek tradition of rhetorical-philosophical persuasiveness in Diod. 1.2.5–6.

⁶⁶ Thanks to Mr. PD Dr. Andreas Scholl (SMPK Berlin), I had the opportunity, in January 2001, to examine closely the original, which was long considered lost (still by Scholl [1994] 247). I wish to express my gratitude for his patience and valuable advice. The stone is a rectangular block of marble (c. 100 cm. long, 30 cm. tall, 19 cm. thick), purchased in Alexandria but originally found in the Rhodian village of Trianda (ancient Ialysos) and now in the magazine of the Pergamonmuseums in Berlin (SMPK Berlin inventory no. Sk 1888). Different dimensions (105.5 by 31 by 9 cm.)

inscriptions identify the deceased as Hieronymus of the Rhodian demos of Tlos, and the sculptor as the otherwise unknown Damatrius (2 White; see p. 476).⁶⁷ The relief, which originally stood over the doorway of the tomb,⁶⁸ is divided into two scenes separated by a stone wall.⁶⁹ On the right is a scene from the Underworld with several gods, among which Hermes Psychopompos, Persephone, Hades, and Psyche can be securely identified. On the left are some men seated on a bench and disputing.⁷⁰

I will confine myself to a short description of the left-hand scene (see p. 477), which is apparently of great relevance for this volume. Five fig-

are reported in Pfuhl-Möbius (1977–79) vol. 2 500. The upper register is a large framed inscriptional field, decorated with floral motifs on either side, which contains the text Ἱερωνύμου | τοῦ Σιμυλίνου Τλωίου in large capitals; below this is a frieze of figures divided into two segments; below this, in another inscriptional field, is the artist's name Δαμάτριος ἐποίησε in smaller capitals. The relief was first published with a reproduction by Hiller and Robert (1902); cf. Fraser (1977) 34–36, 130, Hiller (1912) 229–39 (with fig. 2), Bauer (2000) 227–8 (with pl. 242–4), Scholl (1994) 247–9 (with pl. 7, an enlarged detail of the philosophical scene). For earlier work, see Pfuhl-Möbius (1977–9) vol. 2 501 no. 2085 with pl. 300. See also Matelli in this volume.

⁶⁷ If the relief is in fact from the tomb of the Peripatetic Hieronymus of Rhodes, the hypothesis of Hiller (1912) 236–9 and (1919) 105–7, supported by Fraser (1977) 34 and n. 198, seems most plausible, that Damatrios was the son of the Academic Arideices, son of Eumoiros and disciple of Arcesilaus. See *IG* XII.1 766.288 (= *SGDI* 4159 = *ILind* 88): Δαμάτριος Ἀριδείκευς, ματὶρ[δ]ε ξένας. Hieronymus made his fortune primarily by receiving generous gifts of money from king Antigonos (D.L. 4.41 = 4 White). The lettering of the funeral inscription for Arideices and that on the Hieronymus-relief are very similar, which dates the latter to the end of the third century, since Arideices must have died around 220–200 BCE; see Hiller (1912).

⁶⁸ On the technical aspects of the relief, which formed part of a marble doorway to a large grave monument, see Hiller and Robert (1902) 122–7. For a rough idea of the original appearance of the monument, see the funerary monument for Charmylus and his family in Pyli (Cos) in Scholl (1994) 261–6 with pls. 15–17 (reconstructions). Here too only the two richly decorated doorframes have been preserved; see Simpson and Lazenby (1970) 61–2 and pl. 22a.

⁶⁹ Many scholars, including Curtius (1951) 22, Fraser (1977) 35, Arrighetti (1954) 124, consider this to be not the outer wall of a gymnasium but the doorway of Hades.

⁷⁰ On the left-hand philosophical scene, see Hiller and Robert (1902) 127–9, Pfuhl-Möbius (1977–79) 2.500–1 (the most accurate description), Scholl (1994) 247, Bauer (2000) 248. For the difficult interpretation of the right scene in the underworld, which probably picks up elements of the *Nekuia* by Polygnotus (Paus. 10.30.5), see Hiller and Robert (1902) 129–40, cf. Nilsson (1974) 234 and pl. 4.1, Fraser (1977) 35–6, who concludes, “Whatever may be the correct detailed interpretation of this relief, it stands alone, not only in Rhodian, but in Greek art before the Roman period, as a highly imaginative and symbolic treatment of a funerary theme.”

ures are visible, three of whom are seated on an exedra, as can be recognized by its lion's feet decoration. This scene stands out from the rest of the relief at a slight angle so that the semicircle of the stone bench is emphasized in perspective, although this is not apparent in photographs.⁷¹ Behind the three seated men stands a taller and younger man; all wear a cloak draped over the left shoulder, and the older age of the three seated men is indicated by the larger size of their bodies. The young man has his right arm around the older man sitting beside him, and in his left hand he holds a barely visible citizen's rod at a diagonal to the folds of his cloak, which hang straight down in allusion to his youth (*vέος*). A fifth figure, who is seen from his left, is characterised as an adolescent (*παῖς*) by his slightly smaller proportions and nude torso. He has laid his left arm on the back of the older man, who must be the father of the two younger figures standing on either side of him. That both young men have placed an arm on the back or shoulder of the elder person signifies their family ties. The "father," who is probably the philosopher Hieronymus, leans forward, indicating that he is listening to his contemporary sitting opposite him. He is also dressed in a cloak, which he has thrown over his left shoulder, and like his elder son, he holds in his right hand a citizen's rod which rests at an angle on the ground.⁷² The middle figure represents an older man who (to judge from the size of his face) probably has a beard and wears a tunic beneath the cloak thrown over his shoulders. His arms are resting on his thighs, and he holds the ends of an unrolled bookscroll in his hands.⁷³ He appears to be discussing with the other men what he has just read. Unfortunately, little of the figure seated on the left has survived, only

⁷¹ The discussants are not sitting on chairs as in some Attic reliefs (for parallels, see Scholl [1994] 252 with pl. 3–6), but on a solid semicircular marble exedra, such as were found in gymnasia, *palaestrae*, and marketplaces. On the architectural form of the exedra, see von Thüngen (1994) 16 pl. 1, cf. von Hesberg (1995) 19. On the small number of *συμφιλοσοφούντες*, cf. Isoc. *Panath.* 200: ἐπηγώρθουν μὲν γὰρ τὸν λόγον τὸν μέχρι τῶν ἀναγνωσθέντων γεγραμμένον μετὰ μειρακίων τριῶν ἢ τεττάρων τῶν εἰθισμένων μοι συνδιατρίβειν.

⁷² Scholars still incorrectly interpret the rod held by the "father-figure" as a "pointer"; thus Scholl (1994) 247. But this identification must be ruled out because the stick can clearly be seen to be standing behind and not in front of the feet of the "father-figure." If Damatrios, the artist, had intended to depict one of the philosophers as drawing geometrical figures on a sandy floor, he would surely have left more space between the two central figures, who are sitting very close to one another.

⁷³ Arrighetti (1954) 124 mistakenly identifies this person as the "maestro."

his right leg and right arm, which lies relaxed on his thigh. He wears a similar cloak and is sitting in a posture similar to the figure of the “father.”

This scene clearly does not depict a *paidagogos* or a *grammatistes* teaching, since the main figures who are conversing are characterized as having equal status.⁷⁴ Rather, it must represent a discussion among philosophers or rhetors about the bookscroll held by the central figure. The deceased was not only very prosperous, but must have been also an outstandingly cultivated and educated man. In particular, the scene of philosophers in discussion is so starkly set beside the scene of the underworld that I would identify the deceased as Hieronymus, not least because an essential feature of a philosopher’s activity is reflection on death and continual preparation for it. The scene of the underworld refers directly to the philosopher’s professional concern for life and death, a typical philosophical topic. If we take this into account, the scene on the left tells us more even than the earliest preserved illustration of philosophical instruction (σχολή). Not only does it depict the sons taking leave of their father,⁷⁵ but also his fellow philosophers (συσχολάζοντες), who are presumably discussing death for the last time, and even the soul’s final journey through Hades to eternal life in the Elysian Fields.⁷⁶ Significantly, the scene of the different stages in the soul’s journey to Elysium occupies more space than the scene of the living. Even that may be interpreted as a self-confident gesture demarcating philosophy from rhetoric and an indirect allusion to the conventional defect of sophistic rhetoric which “knows all and nothing.”

⁷⁴ Against the assumption of Hiller and Robert (1902) 141–2 that the Hieronymus of the relief is to be identified with the teacher (γράμματα ἐδίδαξε) who is praised in another Rhodian inscription of the same time, see Arrighetti (1954) 124–7, Fraser (1977) 36 and n. 203.

⁷⁵ Thus Bauer (2000) 248, Scholl (1994) 247, Fraser (1977) 35, who interpret the relief as depicting only a philosophical discussion. On that interpretation, the two youths are simply “young students,” and nothing is made of their obvious affection for the “father-figure,” which is indicated by the gesture of their left and right arms. It also ignores the fact that both the “father-figure” and the standing “young student” hold in their hands not a pointer but a citizen’s rod. These points show that, contrary to claims by Hiller and Robert (1902) 128–9 and many since, the relief is unlike Roman mosaics which seem to depict similar scenes, most notably the alleged depiction of the Platonic Academy on a mosaic from Torre Annunziata; see Gaiser (1980) 2, 9, 15–17, 22, 31, 92–3, 101 pl. 4.

⁷⁶ Curtius (1951) 21–2, Fraser (1977) 35–6.

5.

In conclusion, I would like to take a brief look at the second century. Then it became customary, even fashionable, for a substantial part of the urban elites to study abroad in the cultural centers of the Hellenistic world. That meant in Athens or Rhodes, “with the best professors” (τοῖς ἀρίστοις καθηγηταῖς συνδιατρίβειν), as stated in honorary decrees for Menippus and Polemaeus of Colophon.⁷⁷ In Athens, the increasing admiration for philosophy is attested even earlier. An extreme example of this new enthusiasm for intellectual education is provided by an Athenian who about 230 BCE decided to name his two sons Plato and Speusippus, although it can be proven that he was unrelated to Plato.⁷⁸ This extraordinary choice could not have been intended to do anything other than publicize, even beyond his own life time, his personal interest in philosophy, as well as a general claim to having enjoyed higher intellectual education.

This change in attitude accords well with the fact that Chrysippus, after many years as head of the Stoics, in 208 or 204 became the first philosopher to be granted a statue and citizenship by the Athenians.⁷⁹ With only two known exceptions (statues of Socrates and Zeno), all earlier statues of philosophers had been private donations financed by a few admirers or grateful students. It seems to be no coincidence that henceforth both the teachings of the Athenian philosophers and also their portraits and statues became popular, as statues were set up in cities around the Greek world.⁸⁰ In the cities of Asia Minor especially, statues of Athenian thinkers served as models for public representations of the cities and their elites. The grave reliefs of Smyrna provide striking examples. Their iconography adopted the formulas of Athenian works and developed them further. Many prosperous citizens were now styled as thinkers or scholars through attributes that proclaim their intellectual or philosophical interests, such as bookscrolls, chests of books, or globes.⁸¹

⁷⁷ Robert and Robert (1989) 11.23–4 (Polemaeus), 63.2–4 (Menippus); see also the text (Polemaeus col. 1.20–1, Menippus col. 1.13–14) and comments by Lehmann (1998) 12–13.

⁷⁸ Habicht (1982) 187–8.

⁷⁹ In an Appendix below, I list all attested private and public dedications of statues of philosophers from the fourth to the second century, in order to support my argument.

⁸⁰ Zanker (1995) 260–1, Zanker (1996) 91–133, Smith (1993) 202–11.

⁸¹ Zanker (1993) 117. For examples, see Pfuhl-Möbius no. 70, 855, 861.

Both literary and epigraphic evidence shows that it was only around the middle of the second century that esteem for knowledge and intellectual education became widespread, along with an interest in making it available for a wider public.⁸² The demand for intellectual education, hitherto confined to the social elite, now spread to citizens of the middle class, as numerous documents illustrate, not only grave reliefs and funerary statues but also honorary statues, public decrees, epigrams, and even stone and gems. This was accompanied by a further proliferation of technical and scientific treatises;⁸³ and growing interest in local history generated a new awareness of the past.⁸⁴ This fundamental change was also a crucial precondition for the first public libraries in gymnasia, which began to be established in the mid-second century. Financed by public resources, these libraries were the first to grant access to all citizens.⁸⁵ The change also led to the foundation of public elementary schools in many cities in Asia Minor around the same time.⁸⁶ These measures show that the goal was now for as many citizens as possible, not only the elites, to share as much as feasible in the education of a cultured citizen. This ideal of an educated citizen (πεπαιδευμένος), still an exclusive privilege of the social elite in the

⁸² See again the honorary decree for the Peripatetic Epicrates: *IG* XII.6.1 128.18–23. Most of our literary and epigraphic evidence for νέοι at Hellenistic *gymnasia* (for physical and intellectual education) in the Hellenistic world (see the list in Forbes [1933] 6–10) comes from the second century. On intellectual activities in this institution, see the works cited in n. 28 above, and Delorme (1960) 316–36, Tod (1957), Scholz (2004).

⁸³ On the enormous expansion of philosophical and technical literature, see Susemihl (1891–92) 532–883, Christ and Schmid (1920) 205–308, 425–55. For the “Gelehrtschwemme,” which flooded Greece and Asia Minor after Ptolemy VII Physcon expelled scholars from Alexandria in 146 BCE, see *Ath.* 4 184B–C (Andron of Alexandria *FGrH* 246 F 1, Menecles of Barca *FGrH* 270 F 9); cf. Marrou (1977) 316–17, Pfeiffer (1968) 307.

⁸⁴ Chaniotis (1988) 368–9. For Rhodian “local” history in the second century, see Wiemer (2001) 251–62. Given this development, it comes as no surprise that cults and monuments for poets and wise men were founded during the third century: Homereia in Alexandria, Smyrna, Argos; Archilocheion in Paros; Heroon of Bias in Priene. In the second century, several cities decorated coins with portraits of popular heroes from their own cultural tradition: Archilochus of Paros, Bias of Priene, Anaxagoras of Clazomenae, Stesichorus of Himera, Homer of Ios, Smyrna and Chios; see Zanker (1996) 154–60.

⁸⁵ See n. 33 above.

⁸⁶ See n. 34 above. On the expansion of the functions of the *gymnasia* in Hellenistic times, see Forbes (1945) 32–42, von Hesberg (1995) 13–23, esp. 18–19.

third century, in the following century finally became part of every Greek citizen's shared heritage and identity.⁸⁷

Works Cited

- Antoniadis, E. 1916. *Aristipp und die Kyrenaiker* (Diss. Göttingen).
- Arrighetti, G. 1954. "Ieronimo di Rodi," *Studi Classici e Orientali* 3: 111–28.
- Bauer, J. 2000. "Sog. Damatriosrelief (Nr. 71)," in *Gips nicht mehr: Abgüsse als letzte Zeugen antiker Kunst*, ed. J. Bauer, W. Geominy (Bonn: Akademisches Kunstmuseum der Universität Bonn), 226–8.
- Berve, H. 1926. *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, vol. 2 (Munich: Beck).
- . 1967. *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, vol. 1 (Munich: Beck).
- Blass, F. 1898³. *Die Attische Beredsamkeit*, vol. 3.2 (Leipzig: Teubner). [Hildesheim/New York, 1962/1979]
- Boyancé, P. 1937. *Le culte des muses chez les philosophes grecs* (Paris: Boccard).
- Bouvier, H. 1985. "Hommes de lettres dans les inscriptions Delphiques," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 58: 119–35.
- Breuer, C. 1995. *Reliefs und Epigramme griechischer Privatgrabmäler: Zeugnisse bürgerlichen Selbstverständnisses vom 4. bis zum 2. Jh. v. Chr.* (Cologne & Vienna: Böhlau).
- Bringmann, K. 2000. *Geben und Nehmen: Monarchische Wohltätigkeit und Selbstdarstellung im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* (Berlin: Akademie).
- . 2002. "Rhodos als Bildungszentrum der hellenistischen Welt," *Chiron* 32: 65–81.
- Bringmann, K. and H. von Steuben, eds. 1995. *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*, vol. 1: *Zeugnisse und Kommentare* (Berlin: Akademie).
- Brink, K. O. 1940. "Peripatos," *RE Suppl.* 7: 899–949.

⁸⁷ Cf. Scholz (2000) 110–18 with examples for the most common terms of intellectual education, including πεπαδευμένος, φιλομαθία, παιδεία. An honorary decree from the first century praises Heraclitus of Priene not only as an ideal virtuous citizen but also as highly educated in every intellectual respect (*IvPriene* 117.56–8).

- Bulloch, A. and E. S. Gruen. 1993. *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World* (Berkeley: University of California).
- Busse, A. 1926. "Peripatos und Peripatetiker," *Hermes* 61: 335–42.
- Chaniotis, A. 1988. *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften* (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Christ, W. von and W. Schmid. 1920⁶. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur 2.1: Die nachklassische Periode der griechischen Literatur I: von 320 v. Chr. bis 100 n. Chr.* (Munich: Beck).
- Christes, J. 1975. *Bildung und Gesellschaft: Die Einschätzung der Bildung und ihrer Vermittler in der griechisch-römischen Antike* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).
- Chroust, A. H. 1966. "Aristotle and Athens: Some Comments on Aristotle's Sojourns in Athens," *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 22: 186–96.
- . 1967. "Aristotle Leaves the Academy," *Greece & Rome* 14: 39–43.
- . 1973. *Aristotle: New Light on His Life and on Some of His Lost Works* (London: Routledge & Paul).
- Clarke, M. L. 1971. *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (London: Routledge & Kegan).
- Curtius, L. 1951. "Redeat narratio IV: Zum sogenannten Relief eines Schulmeisters aus Rhodos und zum Unterweltsarkophag von Ephesos," *Mitteilungen des Instituts* 4: 20–8.
- de Bruyn, O. 1995. *La compétence de l'aréopage en matière de procès publics: Des origines de la polis athenienne à la conquete romaine de la Grèce, vers 700–146 av. J.C.* = *Historia Einzelschriften* 90 (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Delorme, J. 1960. *Gymnasion: Étude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce des origines à l'Empire romain* = BEFAR 196 (Paris: Boccard).
- Derenne, E. 1930. *Les procès d'impiété intentés aux philosophes à Athènes au Vme et au IVme siècles avant J. C.* (Liège & Paris: Vaillant-Carmanne). [New York: Arno Press 1976]
- Develin, R. 1989. *Athenian Officials, 684–321 B.C.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University).
- De Witt, N. W. 1954. *Epicurus and his Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota).

- Dihle, A. 1987. "Philosophie, Fachwissenschaft, Allgemeinbildung," in *Aspects de la philosophie hellénistique*, ed. H. Flashar, O. Gigon (Vandoeuvres & Geneva: Fondation Hardt), 185–231.
- Dodds, E. R. 1955. *Plato: Gorgias* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Döring, K. 1988. *Der Sokratesschüler Aristipp und die Kyrenaiker* = AWLMainz 1988.1 (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Dorandi, T. 1991. *Ricerche sulla cronologia dei filosofi ellenistici* (Stuttgart: Teubner).
- . 1999. "Organization and Structure of the Philosophical Schools," in *Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, ed. K. Algra, J. Barnes, J. Mansfeld, M. Schofield (Cambridge: Cambridge University), 55–62.
- Errington, R. M. 1969. *Philopoemen* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Fabricius, J. 1999. *Die hellenistischen Totenmahlreliefs: Bürgerliche Selbstdarstellung auf Grabreliefs ostgriechischer Städte* = Studien zur antiken Stadt 3 (Munich: Pfeil).
- Ferguson, W.S. 1911. *Hellenistic Athens* (London: MacMillan).
- Fittschen, K. 1995. "Eine Stadt für Schaulustige und Müßiggänger: Athen im 3. und 2. Jh. v. Chr.," in Wörle and Zanker (1995) 55–60, 89.
- Flashar, H. 1983. *Die Philosophie der Antike*, vol. 3 (Basel & Stuttgart: Schwabe).
- . 1995. *Die Philosophie der Antike*, vol. 4 (Basel & Stuttgart: Schwabe).
- Forbes, C. A. 1933. *Neoi: A Contribution to the Study of Greek Associations* (Middletown, Conn.: Lancaster).
- . 1945. "Expanded Uses of the Greek Gymnasium," *Classical Philology* 40: 32–42.
- Fraser, P. M. 1977. *Rhodian Funerary Monuments* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Fuentes González, P. P. 1998. *Les diatribes de Télès* (Paris: Vrin).
- Gabrielsen, V. 1996. *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes* (Aarhus: Aarhus University).
- Gabrielsen, V., P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, J. Zahle, eds. 1999. *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture and Society* (Aarhus: Aarhus University).
- Gallo, I. 1976. "Commedia e filosofia in età ellenistica: Batone," *Vichiana* 5: 206–42.

- Gaiser, K. 1980. *Das Philosophenmosaik in Neapel: Eine Darstellung der Akademie* = AAWHeidelberg 1980.2 (Heidelberg: Winter).
- Gauthier, P. 1995. "Notes sur le rôle du gymnase dans les cités hellénistiques," in Wörle and Zanker (1995), 1–11.
- Gauthier, P. and M.B. Hatzopoulos. 1993. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Beroia* = Meletemata 16 (Athens & Paris: Kentron Hellenikes kai Romaikes Archaiothetos).
- Gehrke, H. J. 1976. *Phokion: Studien zur Erfassung seiner historischen Gestalt* (Munich: Beck).
- Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. 1981. "Télès le Cynique," *Revue des Études Grecques* 94: 166–72.
- Gruen, E. S. 1993. "The Polis in the Hellenistic World," in *Nomodeiktēs: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*, ed. R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan), 339–54.
- Guarducci, M. 1927/9. "Poeti vaganti e conferenzieri dell' età ellenistica," *Memorie dell' Accademia dei Lincei*, Classe di scienze morali e storiche 6.2: 627–65.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. 1979. *A History of Greek Philosophy*, vol. 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University).
- Gutzwiller, K. J. 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Berkeley: University of California).
- Habicht, C. 1958. "Die herrschende Gesellschaft in den hellenistischen Monarchien," *Vierteljahresschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 45: 1–16.
- . 1982. *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- . 1988. "Hellenistic Athens and Her Philosophers" (Princeton: Princeton University); reprinted in Habicht 1994.
- . 1992. "Der Kyniker Teles und die Reform der athenischen Ephebie," in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 93: 47–9; reprinted in Habicht 1994.
- . 1994. *Athen in hellenistischer Zeit: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Munich: Beck).
- . 1995a. *Athen: Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit* (Munich: Beck).
- . 1995b. "Ist ein 'Honoratiorenregime' das Kennzeichen der Stadt im späteren Hellenismus?," in Wörle and Zanker (1995), 55–77.

- Hägg, T. 1997. "A Professor and his Slave," in *Conventional Values of the Hellenistic Greeks*, ed. P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, J. Zahle (Aarhus: Aarhus University), 177–203.
- Hahn, J. 1989. *Der Philosoph und die Gesellschaft: Selbstverständnis, öffentliches Auftreten und populäre Erwartungen in der hohen Kaiserzeit* = HABES 7 (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Harris, W. V. 1998. *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University).
- Helm, R. 1906. *Lucian und Menipp* (Leipzig & Berlin: Teubner) [Hildesheim: Olms 1967]
- Hepding, H. 1907. "Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon I: Die Inschriften," *MDAI (A)* 32: 241–377.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. 1912. "Ardeikes und Hieronymos von Rhodos," *Bulletin du correspondance hellénique* 36: 229–39.
- . 1919. "Damatrios und Ardeikes," *Hermes* 54: 105–7.
- . 1931. "Rhodos," *RE Suppl.* 5: 731–840.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, F. and C. Robert. 1902. "Relief von dem Grabmal eines rhodischen Schulmeisters," *Hermes* 37: 121–46.
- Jacobsthal, P. 1908. "Die Arbeiten zu Pergamon II: Die Inschriften," *MDAI (A)* 33: 375–420.
- Kebirc, R. B. 1977. *In the Shadow of Macedon: Duris of Samos* (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Kindstrand, F. 1976. *Bion of Borysthenes* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell).
- Kleijwegt, M. 1991. *Ancient Youth* (Leiden: Gieben).
- Kühnert, F. 1961. *Allgemeinbildung und Fachbildung in der Antike* (Berlin: Akademie).
- Kunst, C. 1917. "De Aeschine Rhodi exsulante," *Wiener Studien* 39: 167–70.
- Lehmann, G. A. 1998. "Römischer Tod," in *Kolophon & Klaros: Neue Quellen zum Status der "freien" Polisstaaten an der Westküste Kleinasien im späten zweiten Jahrhundert v. Chr.* = NAWG I. Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1998.3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Lloyd, G. E. R. 1991. "The Social Background of Early Greek Philosophy and Science," in Lloyd, *Methods and Problems in Greek Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University), 121–40.
- Long, A. A. 1993. "Hellenistic Ethics and Philosophical Power," in

- Hellenistic History and Culture*, ed. P. Green (Berkeley: University of California), 138–67.
- Lynch, J. P. 1972. *Aristotle's School: Study of a Greek Educational Institution* (Berkeley: University of California).
- Marasco, G. 1984. *Democaro di Leuconoe: Politica e cultura ad Atene fra IV e III esc. a.C.* (Florenz: Licos).
- Marek, C. 1984. *Die Proxenie* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang).
- Marrou, H. I. 1938. *Μουσικὸς Ἀνὴρ: Études sur les scènes de la vie intellectuelle figurant sur les monuments funéraires romains* (Grenoble: Didier & Richard).
- . 1977. *Geschichte der Erziehung im klassischen Altertum* (Munich: Beck). [Paris, 1948]
- Marzi, M. 1991. “Demade politico e oratore,” *Atene & Roma* 36: 70–83.
- Meissner, B. 1992. *Historiker zwischen Polis und Königshof* = Hypomnemata 99 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Merritt, B. D. 1935. “Greek Inscriptions,” *Hesperia* 4: 525–85.
- Moretti, L. 1967. *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche*, vol. 1 (Firenze: La nuova Italia).
- Mygind, B. 1999. “Intellectuals in Rhodes,” in Gabrielsen et al. (1999), 247–93.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1974². *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, vol. 2 (Munich: Beck).
- O’Neil, E. N. *Teles: The Cynic Teacher* (Missoula: Scholars Press).
- Papachristodoulou, I. C. 1988–90. “Das hellenistische Gymnasium von Rhodos: Neues zu seiner Bibliothek,” *Akten des 13 Internationalen Kongresses für Klassische Archäologie* (Mainz: Zabern), 500–1, pl. 75.3–4.
- Peek, W. 1960. *Griechische Grabgedichte* (Berlin: Akademie).
- Perrin, E. 1994. “Héracléides le Crétois à Athènes,” *Revue des Études Grecques* 107: 192–202.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Pfister, F. 1951. *Die Reisebilder des Herakleides: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar mit einer Übersicht über die Geschichte der griechischen Volkskunde* = SBAWWien 227.2 (Vienna: Rohrer).

- Pfuhl, E. and H. Möbius. 1977–9. *Die ostgriechischen Grabreliefs* (Mainz: Zabern).
- Quass, F. 1993. *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens: Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit* (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Radermacher, L. 1947. *Weinen und Lachen: Studien über antikes Lebensgefühl* (Vienna: Rohrer).
- Regenbogen, O. 1940. "Theophrastos (no. 3)," *RE Suppl.* 7: 1354–1562.
- Richter, G. M. A. 1965. *The Portraits of the Greeks*, vol. 1–2 (London: Phaidon)
- Robert, L. 1973. "Les inscriptions," in *Fouilles d'Ai-Khanoum*, vol. 1.1, ed. P. Bernard (Paris: de Boccard), 207–37.
- Robert, J. and L. Robert. 1983. *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie*, vol. 1 (Paris: de Boccard).
- . 1989. *Claros: Décrets hellénistiques*, vol. 1 (Paris: Recherche sur les civilisations).
- Roesch, P. 1982. *Études béotiennes* (Paris: Boccard).
- Schede, M. 1919. "Aus dem Heraion von Samos," *MDAI (A)* 44: 1–34.
- Schmidt, S. 1991. *Hellenistische Grabreliefs: Typologische und chronologische Beobachtungen* (Cologne & Vienna: Böhlau).
- Schmitt, H. H., and E. Vogt. 1988. *Kleines Wörterbuch des Hellenismus* (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz).
- Schneider, C. 1967–9. *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus*, vol.1–2 (Munich: Beck).
- Scholl, A. 1994. "ΠΟΛΥΤΑΛΑΝΤΑ ΜΝΗΜΕΙΑ: Zur literarischen und monumentalen Überlieferung aufwendiger Grabmäler im spätklassischen Athen," *Jahrbuch des Instituts* 109: 239–71.
- Scholz, P. 1998. *Der Philosoph und die Politik: Die Ausbildung der philosophischen Lebensform und die Entwicklung des Verhältnisses von Philosophie und Politik im Athen des 4. und 3. Jh. v. Chr.* (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- . 2000. "Zur Bedeutung von Rede und Rhetorik in der hellenistischen Paideia und Politik," in *Rede und Redner: Bewertung und Darstellung in den antiken Kulturen*, ed. C. Neumeister, W. Raack (Möhnesee: Bibliopolis), 95–118.

- . 2004. "Elementarunterricht und intellektuelle Bildung im hellenistischen Gymnasium," in *Das hellenistische Gymnasium*, ed. D. Kah, P. Scholz (Berlin: Akademie), 103–28.
- Segre, M. 1935. "Epigraphica I: Catalogo di libri da Rodi," *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 63 (n.s. 13): 214–22.
- Seibert, H. 1979. *Die politischen Flüchtlinge und Verbannten in der griechischen Geschichte: Von den Anfängen bis zur Unterwerfung durch die Römer* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).
- Shipley, G. 1987. *A History of Samos 800–188 B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Simpson, R. H. and J. F. Lazenby. 1970. "Notes from the Dodecanese," *BSA* 65: 48–77.
- Skalet, C. H. 1928. *Ancient Sicyon, with a Prosopographia Sicyonia* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University).
- Smith, R. R. R. 1993. "Kings and Philosophers," in Bulloch and Gruen (1993), 202–11.
- Sollenberger, M. 1992. "The Lives of the Peripatetics: An Analysis of the Contents and Structure of Diogenes Laertius' *Vitae philosophorum* Book 5," in *ANRW II* 36.6 (Berlin & New York: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 3793–879.
- Sonnabend, H. 1996. *Die Freundschaften der Gelehrten und die zwischenstaatliche Politik im klassischen und hellenistischen Griechenland* (Hildesheim, Zurich, New York: Olms).
- Susemihl, F. 1891–2. *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Tod, M. N. 1957. "Sidelights on Greek Philosophers," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 77: 132–41.
- Traill, J. S. 2000. *Persons of Athens* (Toronto: Athenians).
- Trampedach, K. 1994. *Plato, die Akademie und die zeitgenössische Politik* = Hermes Einzelschriften 66 (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Transier, P. 1985. *Samiaka: Epigraphische Studien zur Geschichte von Samos in hellenistischer Zeit und römischer Zeit* (Diss. Mannheim).
- van Gelder, H. 1900. *Geschichte der alten Rhodier* (Hague: Nijhoff) [Aalen: Scientia, 1979].
- von Arnim, A. 1898. *Leben und Werk des Dion von Prusa I* (Berlin: Weidmann).
- von den Hoff, R. 1994. *Philosophenporträts des Früh- und Hochhellenismus* (Munich: Biering & Brinkmann).

- von Hesberg, H. 1995. "Das griechische Gymnasium im 2. Jh. v. Chr.," in Wörrle and Zanker (1995) 13–27.
- von Thüngen, S. Freifrau. 1994. *Die freistehende Exedra* (Mainz: Zabern).
- Wacker, C. 1996. *Das Gymnasion von Olympia: Geschichte und Funktion* (Würzburg: Ergon).
- Wallace, R. W. 1989. *The Areopagos Council to 307 B.C.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University).
- Weber, G. 1993. *Dichtung und höfische Gesellschaft: Die Rezeption von Zeitgeschichte am Hof der ersten drei Ptolemäer* = Hermes Einzelschriften 62 (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Webster, T. B. L. 1970². *Studies in Later Greek Comedy* (Manchester: Manchester University).
- Weiher, A. 1913. *Philosophen und Philosophenspott in der attischen Komödie* (Diss. Munich).
- Whitehead, D. 1977. *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic* (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society).
- . 1993. *The Demes of Attica, 508/7–ca. 250 B.C.: A Political and Social Study* (Princeton: Princeton University).
- Wiemer, U. 2001. *Krieg, Handel und Piraterie: Untersuchungen zur Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichte des hellenistischen Rhodos* = Frankfurter Althistorische Beiträge 7 (Frankfurt am Main: Marthe Clauss).
- Wilamowitz Moellendorff, U. von. 1881. *Antigonos von Karystos* = Philologische Untersuchungen 4 (Berlin: Weidmann).
- Wörrle, M. "Vom tugendsamen Jüngling zum 'gestreßten' Euergeten: Überlegungen zum Bürgerbild hellenistischer Ehrendekrete," in Wörrle and Zanker (1995), 241–50.
- Wörrle, M. and P. Zanker, eds. 1995. *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus* (Munich: Beck).
- Wormell, D. E. W. 1935. "The Literary Tradition Concerning Hermias of Atarneus," *Yale Classical Studies* 5: 57–92.
- Wycherley, R. 1961. "Peripatos: The Athenian Philosophical Scene I," *Greece & Rome* 8: 152–63.
- . 1962. "Peripatos: The Athenian Philosophical Scene II," *Greece & Rome* 9: 2–21.
- Zanker, P. 1993. "The Hellenistic Grave Stelai from Smyrna: Identity and Self-image in the Polis," in Bulloch and Gruen (1993), 212–30.

- . 1995. “Brüche im Bürgerbild? Zur bürgerlichen Selbstdarstellung in den hellenistischen Städten,” in Wörrle and Zanker (1995), 251–73.
- . 1996. *Die Maske des Sokrates* (Munich: Beck).
- Ziebarth, E. 1914². *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen* (Leipzig & Berlin: Teubner).
- Zumpt, H. 1843. *Ueber den Bestand der philosophischen Schulen in Athen und die Succession der Scholarchen* (Berlin: Dümmler).

Appendix

STATUES OF PHILOSOPHERS, SOPHISTS, AND RHETORICIANS (4th–2d century BCE)

A. Private Dedications

about 380	Socrates (type A) at the Academy, dedicated to the Muses by Plato and his students (Richter 1.112)
about 400	Gorgias I: a gold-plated statue on column, dedicated by himself at Delphi (Plin. <i>NH</i> 33.83; Paus. 10.18.7; Richter 1.120)
about 370	Gorgias II: dedicated by Eumolpus, great-nephew of the sophist, at Olympia (Paus. 6.17.7; Richter 1.120)
370–356	Isocrates I: dedicated by Timotheus at Eleusis ([Plut.] <i>Vit. X or.</i> 838D; Richter 2.209)
about 360	Aristippus: dedicated by his students in Cyrene or Athens ? (Richter 2.175–6)
about 355	Eudoxus: sculpted relief, dedicated by his students ? (Richter 2.244)
after 347	Plato: work of Silanion, dedicated by Plato’s Persian student Mithradates to the Muses of the Academy (D.L. 3.25–6)
after 338	Isocrates II: statue on column, dedicated by his adopted son Aphaereus at the Olympieion in Athens (Paus. 1.18.8; [Plut.] <i>Vit. X or.</i> 839B; Richter 2.209)
334	Theodectes of Phaselis: grave monument at the road to Eleusis with other statues (?) depicting poets (Richter 2.224)

352 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

after 322	Aristotle: dedicated by Theophrastus and other students at the Lyceum (D.L. 5.51; Richter 2.171)
314	Xenocrates ? (Richter 2.179)
4th cent.	Aeschines ? (Richter 2.213)
288/285	Theophrastus: dedicated by his students at the Lyceum ? (Richter 2.177)
about 280	Protagoras: seated statue within the exedra in the Sarapeion at Memphis
about 280 ?	Philosopher Dion of Ephesus: work of Sthennis, dedicated by students (?) (Richter 2.244)
after 278/277	Seated statue of Metrodorus, dedicated by the members of the Kepos (Richter 2.200)
about 270	Strato ?: grave monument (D.L. 5.64; Richter 2.178)
after 271/270	Seated statue of Epicurus at the Kepos (Richter 2.198)
after 270	Seated statue of Hermarchos at the Kepos (Richter 2.205)
250-200	Epicurus: statue in ancient Paphos (<i>BSA</i> 56 [1961] 7 no. 10; Richter 2.195)
225	Lyco: statue, dedicated at the Lyceum (D.L. 5.69; Richter 2.178)
after 208/204	Chrysippus I: seated statue, dedicated by his nephew Aristocreon of Soloi (Plut. <i>De Sto. rep.</i> 1033E; Richter 2.190)
after 155:	Carneades: statue, dedicated by his students Attalus and Ariarathes (<i>Syll.</i> ³ 666)

B. Posthumous Honorary Statues and Honouring Depictions on Coins

about 380	Lysias (Richter 2.207)
about 330	Socrates (Typus B): honorary statue, work of Lysippus, initiated by Lycurgus and dedicated at the Pompeium (Richter 1.116)
324/323	Lycurgus I: honorary statue in the Cerameicus ([Plut.] <i>Vit. X or.</i> 843C–E; Richter 2.212)
307/306	Lycurgus II: honorary statue in the Agora ([Plut.] <i>Vit. X or.</i> 847D; Richter 2.212)
307/306	Hypereides: honorary statue for his efforts in freeing Athens from the rule of Demetrius (Richter 2.210)
about 280	Menedemus of Eretria: small statue in the stadium of his home town (D.L. 2.132; Richter 2.244)
280	Demosthenes: bronze honorary statue in the Athenian

	Agora ([Plut.] <i>Vit. X or.</i> 847A; Richter 2.216)
271	Demochares: bronze honorary statue in the Athenian Agora ([Plut.] <i>Vit. X or.</i> 847DE; Richter 2.224)
264/261	Honorary decree in favour of Zeno of Citium, initiated by Antigonus Gonatas: bronze statue and golden crown (D.L. 7.6, 10–12)
	Zeno: honorary statue in Citium (D.L. 7.6)
208/204	Chrysippus II: honorary statue at the Cerameicus (Richter 2.194)
about 200	Balacrus son of Meleagrus, author of <i>Makedonika</i> , at Pergamon: statue (<i>IvPergamon</i> 201; Richter 2.247)
	Apollonius, son of Philotas, author of <i>Karika</i> ?, at Pergamon: statue (<i>IvPergamon</i> 202; Richter 2.247)
2th cent.	Antisthenes: honorary statue at Cynosarges ? (Richter 2.179)
	Cleanthes: honorary statue ? (Richter 2.189)
	Diogenes: honorary statue in Corinth (Richter 2.182)
	Crates of Thebes ? (Richter 2.185–86)
	Menippus of Gadara ? (Richter 2.185)
	Epicurus III: honorary statue at Samos ? (D.L. 10.9; Richter 2.195)
	Aratus of Soloi/Cilicia: grave monument ? (Pomp. Mel. <i>Chorogr.</i> 1.71; Richter 2.239)
150-120	Polybius: honorary statue, dedicated by the Eleans at Olympia (<i>IvOlympia</i> 243; Richter 2.248)
	Honorary statue at Pallantion (Paus. 8.44.5; Richter 2.248)
about 100	Anaxagoras (on coins of Clazomenae)

6

Third-Century Peripatetics on Vision

Todd Stuart Ganson

Aristotle's theory of vision articulated in *De anima* and *De sensu* seems quickly to have fallen out of favor in the Lyceum. I have in mind a defining feature of that theory: Aristotle's dismissal of claims that vision involves emanations either from the eye or from the visible object.¹ This twofold rejection of emanations is what principally distinguishes the Aristotelian theory of vision from its rivals.² Accordingly, when Peripatetics move beyond the views about emanations set out in *De anima* and *De sensu*, it is tempting to suppose that they were influenced by theories of vision developed outside the Lyceum.

I want to resist this temptation in the case of emanations from the object of vision. Later Peripatetics routinely invoke emanations from sense-objects in spite of Aristotle's insistence that visible objects as such do not release anything into the medium of vision. However, we need not suppose that these later Peripatetics are drawing on the effluence theories of the Atomists or Empedocleans. I will suggest that they

¹ Aristotle rejects emanations from the visible object at 422a15 and 440a15–20 (cf. 418b15); he rejects emanations from the eye at 438a25–b2.

² See, e.g., Alexander's way of distinguishing the Aristotelian theory from rival accounts in *Mantissa* 127–47.

are developing their own account, which has its roots in Aristotle's remarks on vision.

I

To avoid possible confusion I want to be perfectly clear about what position I am attributing to Aristotle. We need to distinguish two claims. First is the claim that sense-perception of an object does not require the emission of any parts from the object perceived. Second is the claim that the proper objects of sense-perception (colors, sounds, odors, etc.) do not enter into the medium of perception. I have discussed Aristotle's puzzling attitude toward the second claim elsewhere;³ my concern here is with the first claim. I assume that Aristotle consistently maintains this first claim, and that later Peripatetics do not.

That these two theses are independent is clear when we consider the case of odor. One might suppose that odors come to be present in the air between the cheese and the nose without the cheese's releasing any parts. Perhaps the odor in the air is a product of causal interaction between the cheese and the air that does not involve any exchange of material parts. In that case the proper object of perception enters into the air without the involvement of olfactory emanations. This is precisely the view Aristotle defends in *De sensu* 5, where he defines odor as the nature of the flavored dry in the moisture of air and water (443a7). Air and water come to have odors present in them because of the cleansing and washing action of their moisture on the flavored dry (442b29–443a2), where cleansing and washing clearly do not involve the separation of parts from the smelly object.

II

Peripatetics after Aristotle were not so concerned to avoid commitment to olfactory emanations. Theophrastus, Aristotle's successor in the Lyceum, defines odor as a certain kind of emanation. I want briefly to consider this alternative to Aristotle's account of odor, for Theophrastus' remarks on odor will help us make sense of developments in Peripatetic thinking about vision.

Theophrastus defines odor as "the intermixture of the flavored dry in the transparent" (*De causis plantarum* 6.1.1). This emphasis on the role of intermixture is important here. Unlike Aristotle, who is evidently

³ Ganson (2002).

intent on resisting the suggestion that smelly objects *qua* smelly release any material parts which might enter into the moisture of the transparent substances (i.e., air and water), Theophrastus takes odor to be a result of the flavored dry's mixing in with the moisture of air and water. That is, dry parts of the smelly object become integrated into the medium by way of a process of mixture, and the product of this mixing is odor.

Theophrastus evidently disagrees with Aristotle about how transparent substances interact with smelly surfaces, but it is highly unlikely that Empedoclean or Atomistic influences are at work here. After all, the idea that the proper object of perception might reach the sense-organ by way of a process of mixture comes from Aristotle:

Hence even if we were under water, we would perceive a sweet object thrown into it; but the perception would not come about for us through a medium, but because of the mixing of the object with the moisture, just as in the case of a drink. But color is not seen in this way as the result of mixing, nor by effluences. There is, then, no medium here. [422a11–16]⁴

Aristotle distinguishes two ways in which the proper object of perception might travel to the respective sense-organ: either by mixing in with the moisture of air (or water) or by effluences. The latter, of course, is the view that Aristotle and Theophrastus attribute to Empedocles and Democritus. The former is a novel suggestion which Theophrastus adopts in his account of odor.

So why did Theophrastus endorse this alternative approach to odor? One possible motive is worth mentioning here. Theophrastus needed to explain why some flowers are more fragrant at a distance, and he found this task more manageable on the assumption that what travels through the air to the perceiver has properties like thickness and weight. So, for example, the earthy particles that pass into the air will not travel as far as other purer substances:

Some flowers are . . . more fragrant at a distance than upon closer approach, as violets are said to be. The reason is this: the odor is pure and unmixed when it carries to distant objects; but when an object is near by, some portion of other parts of the plant than the flower is carried along, particles too earthy and thick to reach the greater distance. [*De causis plantarum* 6.17.1, translation by Einarson and Link]

⁴ Translations are my own except where I indicate otherwise.

This attractive sort of explanation is not available to Aristotle, so we have here one strong motive for shifting to the mixture theory.

There is some evidence that Theophrastus' account of odor supplanted Aristotle's in the Lyceum. In *Problemata* 12 we find that the odors we smell are due to material emanations that mix into the air (see 906a23–9). Furthermore, later Peripatetics are evidently in agreement with Theophrastus' explanation of why some flowers are more fragrant at a distance, an explanation which clearly appeals to olfactory emanations (see *Problemata* 906a30–4, 907a24–8, and Hieronymus 10).

III

Our most significant source for Peripatetic thinking about the objects of vision around the time of Theophrastus is the treatise *De coloribus*, a work erroneously included in the Aristotelian corpus. Whoever wrote the treatise was clearly immersed in Peripatetic doctrine, but the text also contains significant departures from Aristotle's views on color and light.⁵ My focus here will be on the author's commitment to emanations from the object of vision.

One of the more provocative views expressed in *De coloribus* is the claim that “we do not see any of the colors pure as they are” (793b12–13). In the course of defending this claim about seeing pure colors, the author posits emanations from the object of vision:

We do not see any of the colors pure as they are, but all are mixed in others. For since they are mixed, if not with any other colors, at any rate with rays of light and shadows, they appear different and not as they are. Accordingly, they appear different when viewed in shade or in light and sunshine, and when in hard or soft light, and in accordance with their inclining in this or that direction, and because of other differences. Further, they appear different when viewed by the rays in the presence of fire or the moon or by the rays belonging to lamps, for the light of each of these has a different color. Further, they appear different due to the mixture of the colors with one another, for they are colored as they move through one another. For whenever the incident light is colored by objects, and it becomes, say, crimson or green, and then the light reflected falls upon another color, as it mixes with this color in turn it takes on another mixture of color. Undergoing this process continuously and imperceptibly, the light reaching the eyes is sometimes mixed from many colors, though the light of one of the strongest components produces the sensation. Accordingly, things appear more watery in water, and things viewed in mirrors manifestly have colors similar to

⁵ The most helpful and up-to-date discussion of the authorship of *De coloribus* is Woehrle (1999) 31–51.

those present in the mirrors. We must suppose the same thing happens in the case of air. So all the colors <we see> are mixed from three items: (i) the light, (ii) that through which the light appears (i.e., water and air), and (iii) the underlying colors from which the light is reflected. [793b12–794a2]

The author is here attempting to account for differences in color appearance due to variations in the lighting, in the medium, and in the surrounding colors. How surface colors appear is invariably affected by these latter variations. The author explains this phenomenon by appeal to a process of mixture. The colors we see are due to a mixture of three items: (i) the light, (ii) the medium, and (iii) the surface color. The surfaces of colored objects release parts that mix together with the transparent medium (air or water) and the light. In this way seeing involves emanations from visible objects.

In the passage from *De anima* quoted above (422a11–16), Aristotle implicitly distinguishes three approaches to vision: his own account (distinguished from the other two because of its lack of commitment to material emanations); the effluence theory of the Empedocleans and Atomists; and a third account, which I will call “the mixture theory,” that is very likely Aristotle’s own creation. I suggest that the mixture theory remained purely hypothetical until the author of *De coloribus* came to embrace it. In accepting this theory, the author of *De coloribus* follows Theophrastus’ lead insofar as Theophrastus embraces a mixture theory of smell.

IV

Once we see that the mixture theory of vision is a genuine option for third-century Peripatetics thinking about vision, we have reason to be cautious when interpreting Strato and Hieronymus, who evidently reject Aristotle’s theory of vision insofar as they posit emanations from the objects of vision. We should not straightaway conclude, as some have, that Atomist influences are at work here.⁶ We have to take seriously the possibility that they too accept the mixture theory, a distinctively Peripatetic approach to vision.

I begin with Strato. According to one report, “Strato says colors are carried from bodies, giving the mediating air the same color as the bodies” (fr. 113 = Aetius 4.13.7). Wehrli assimilates Strato’s view here to

⁶ See, e.g., Teodorsson (1989) 138. Cf. Wehrli’s comment on Strato fr. 113.

that of the Atomists, but this interpretation is problematic.⁷ Strato's claim that the air itself takes on the color of the object is difficult to square with the Atomist assumption that effluences push their way through the air, without any physical mixing of air and effluence. Why should the air itself become colored on such a view? We can more readily make sense of Strato's claim on the assumption that he posits a process of mixture taking place in the medium. On this reading Strato is sympathetic to the view expressed in *De coloribus* that surface colors enter into the air by way of a process of mixture.

Now consider Hieronymus. In a discussion of presbyopia (*Table Talks* 1.8) Plutarch attributes the following view to Hieronymus:

... that we see by means of the bodies coming from visible objects that encounter our vision. These bodies are large and dense when they first depart, which is why they disturb the elderly when they are nearby, since their eyesight is tough and not very porous. But after the bodies are released into the air and travel some distance, the earthy particles get worn away and fall off, while the fine ones, when they reach their vision, fit their pores evenly and painlessly; so they are disturbed less and perceive better. Likewise, the odors of flowers are more fragrant when they strike us at a distance; but if you get too close, their odor is not as pure or undiluted. The cause is that many earthy and muddy particles are emitted along with the odor, and they ruin its fragrance when it is received from nearby; but if received from a distance, the muddy and earthy particles flow away and sink down, while its purity and heat is preserved by its fineness until it reaches our sense. [10, translation by White]

The case for supposing that Atomist influence is at work here is a bit stronger than in Strato's case. The emanations mentioned here are said to be "worn away" by the intervening air (not mixed into the air), so that the earthy parts fall off. This feature of the account is more in line with the effluence theory than the mixture theory.

However, this point is less decisive than it may seem. In making the comparison with smell, Hieronymus agrees with the claim in *De causis plantarum* and *Problemata* that earthy parts fall to the ground earlier because of their weight. But in *De causis plantarum* and *Problemata* this claim about earthy particles is presumably compatible with the mixture theory of smell, since both treatises express a commitment to the mixture theory.⁸ Accordingly, we should not straightaway assume

⁷ Wehrli (1969) 73.

⁸ In the case of *Problemata* "commitment" is perhaps too strong a word given the tentative nature of the remarks throughout this work.

that Hieronymus' talk about how particles wear away and fall off is incompatible with a mixture theory of vision. At any rate, there is no reason to suppose that Hieronymus' views on vision are shaped by Atomist influences rather than by exposure to Peripatetic works like *De coloribus* and *De causis plantarum*. Hieronymus' central assumptions are largely continuous with the views on sense-perception developed by other third-century Peripatetics. Furthermore, we should keep in mind that Plutarch is attributing these views on vision here to his own brother as well as to Hieronymus, and this fact raises doubts about the suggestion that the theory in question is Atomist in origin.⁹ Plutarch explicitly presents his brother as a Peripatetic (635A–B), and Plutarch himself is hardly sympathetic with Epicureanism.

V

There is some reason to suppose that the mixture theory became reasonably well known even outside the Lyceum. One piece of evidence in favor of this hypothesis is that the sixth mode of Aenesidemus appears to have been inspired by that theory. Consider Diogenes' characterization of this mode:

Sixth is the mode depending on mixtures and shares; it shows that nothing appears purely in itself, but together with air, with light. . . . For instance, purple shows a different color in sunlight, moonlight, and lamplight. . . . So we are ignorant of things in their own nature, as we are of oil in a perfume. [9.84, translation by Annas and Barnes]

Philo's discussion of this mode is also relevant here:

Anyone who goes into things more closely and looks at them in a purer light will recognize that no one thing affects us according to its own simple nature; all of them contain the most elaborate mixture and blends. . . . Well, do the odors from burning incense present us with the natures of these substances in simple and pure form, or rather as blends of themselves and of the air . . . ? [On Drunkenness 189–90, translation by Annas and Barnes]

Aenesidemus is raising an important question for proponents of the mixture theory. Although we may very well be able to say what the proximate stimulus—the mixture that reaches the sense-organ—is like, we are unable to determine the character of the distant items that gave rise to that stimulus. We are unable to cognize these distal items

⁹ This point is made by Teodorsson (1989) 138.

adequately because we cannot decipher what contribution each makes to the mixture that confronts us. After all, any specific mixture could be generated by a plurality of different combinations.

Aenesidemus' worry here is, I believe, a natural response to the claim in *De coloribus* that we do not see any colors pure as they are. When the author of *De coloribus* claims that all the colors we see are a product of the light, the medium, and the surface color, he thereby exposes himself to just the sort of epistemological problem that Aenesidemus points out.

Works Cited

- Annas, J. and Barnes, J. 1985. *The Modes of Scepticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University).
- Einarson, B. and Link, G. 1990. *Theophrastus: De causis plantarum* Books 5–6 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University).
- Ganson, T. 2002. "A Puzzle concerning the Aristotelian Notion of a Medium of Sense-Perception," in *On the Opuscula of Theophrastus*, ed. W. Fortenbaugh and G. Wöhrle (Stuttgart: Steiner), 65–74.
- Teodorsson, S.-T. 1989. *A Commentary on Plutarch's "Table Talks,"* vol. 1 (Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis).
- Wehrli, F. 1969. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 5: *Straton von Lampsakos* (Basel: Schwabe).
- Wöhrle, G. 1999. *Aristoteles: De coloribus* (Berlin: Akademie).

7

The Historical Setting of Hieronymus fr. 10 White (= fr. 53 Wehrli)*

Peter Lautner

Hieronymus fr. **10** (Plutarch *Quaestiones convivales* 1.8 626A–B) discusses a problem partly inherited from Aristotle's *De anima* 2.7 (419a12–13, 26–31), where the Stagirite talks about the failure of sight whenever the object to be seen is put on the sense organ. If one places something that has color upon the eye itself, it will not be seen. As he says, nothing that touches the sense-organ brings about sensation. This is obvious in the case of sight, smell and hearing. That is why Democritus was wrong to say that we would see an ant in the sky if there was nothing in between us and the ant (419a15); for if there were nothing in between, then there would be no medium that the ant could affect first and which in turn could act on our sense-organ. There is a need for an intervening medium. The object moves an appropriate medium, and that in turn acts on the sense-organ. But if we place an object of smell on the sense-organ, no sensation follows. The same holds true of touch and taste, but this is not obvious since the organs of these

* An earlier version of this paper was delivered in Austin. I am grateful to Sylvia Berryman, Han Baltussen, Bill Fortenbaugh, Todd Ganson, David Hahm, Richard Sorabji, Bob Sharples and Stephen White whose questions and suggestions led to considerable improvements.

senses are in the interior of the body, not on the surface. In addition, Aristotle investigates a medical problem: how should one account for far-sightedness? I think that, unlike Aristotle, Hieronymus could offer one explanation for both phenomena. From this point of view, he had a unitary theory.

Fragment **10** can be divided into two parts, one sketching a general theory of sense perception and applying it to sight, and another applying the same theory to smell. The application is not exactly the one we would expect. The latter part has received considerable attention.¹ It has become clear that Hieronymus was influenced by Theophrastus (*De causis plantarum* 6.17.1; *De odoribus* 45, 50) and the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata* (12.2 906a30–5; 12.9 907a24–8). If we take a closer look at the first part, it may also become clear that Hieronymus had other kinds of allegiances as well. But that is not to say that his theory is derived entirely from those of his predecessors.

On the whole, Hieronymus' explanation of the problem modifies Aristotle's theory on two points. 1) Unlike Aristotle, who thinks that sense-perception is the reception of the sensible form by the sense, Hieronymus assumes that the entities coming from the sensible object are bodily in nature: they are fragile (περιθράύεται) and have light and heavy parts that are also different in quality (τὰ μὲν γεώδη . . . τὰ δὲ λεπτά; τὰ μὲν θολερά καὶ γεώδη).² 2) As they travel away from the sensible object, the heavier parts are separated out and fall down.³ It seems, then, that Hieronymus rejected the explanation of sense perception in terms of a form being received by the sense. Instead, he seems to have adhered to the view that sense perception occurs on account of the interaction between two material objects. This interpretation may be corroborated by the use of ἀλύπως in **10.9**. First of all, Hieronymus is almost certainly talking about physical pain, not about distress. That sets limits to the claim that the context of the whole testimony is an

¹ See the critical apparatus in Hubert (1938) 34; cf. Wehrli (1969c) 43–4, Teodorsson (1989) 138–41. The issue is re-examined by Sharples (forthcoming).

² The verb περιθράύεται may remind one of Theophrastus, *De sensibus* 11 (κατὰ μικρὰ τεθραυσμένα). But the context in Theophrastus does not seem to be relevant for Hieronymus. I owe the reference to Han Baltussen.

³ ἀνενεχθέντων in **10.6** may not refer to upward motion. Rather, it means only that the effluences are carried away from the source. On the other hand, we must see that Theophrastus (*HP* 4.2.2) and Strato (fr. 88, 111) use the verb ἀναφέρεσθαι to refer to upward motion in a similar context.

investigation of pleasure. Such an investigation should be about both bodily and psychic pleasures. But there is no sign that Hieronymus hinted at distress here. Furthermore, even if we accept that a materialistic theory such as that of Hieronymus must account for distress in terms of bodily interactions, we do not have to admit that the explanations of physical pain and psychic distress have to use the same terms, or that they have to be structured in the same way.

One would like to know how Hieronymus arrived at this solution; unfortunately the available evidence only allows us to speculate on this point. The question is, then, how pain can come about in sense perception. Aristotle talks about excesses of sensible qualities that destroy the sense organ (*De anima* 424a29). He says that if the change produced in sense perception is too strong, the sense itself also perishes, just as harmony and pitch do if the strings are struck too hard. Now, it is obvious that here Hieronymus does not claim that over-stimulation of the sense organ results in pain. He might have said it elsewhere, but in this fragment his point is that by losing their earthy and coarse parts, the effluences become fine. In virtue of this change, they do not scratch or graze the walls of the pores. This is a process that implies interaction between bodies. But it is not on account of the excessively large flow of corpuscles entering the pores that we feel pain. Rather, the painful feeling is due to the shape and the size of the corpuscles that strain the sense organ. On the other hand, Hieronymus' explanation makes no sense in the scheme of *De anima* and *De sensu*, for neither the εἶδη nor the εἶδωλα are material. They can destroy the sense because it is a kind of relation, a λόγος (424a30). Hence I suggest that in 10.3 we should fill the lacuna with <σώμα>σι, not <εἶδε>σι, as Stephanus did.⁴ To use εἶδος in such a context would be very unusual.⁵ As far as I can see, the Peripatetics never talked about forms that have material constituents. It is

⁴ The supplement runs counter to Stephanus' report that the lacuna contains a space for 2–3 letters only. But <εἶδε>σι is not much better. Stephanus' reading of the whole passage (10.1–3) was already criticized by Wyttenbach (1797) 530; he suggests: Λαμπρίας δὲ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἔφη θαυμάζειν εἴ τις τὴν Ἱερωνόμου βίβλον οὐκ ἀνέγνωκεν ἐν ᾗ φησιν κατ' Ἐμπεδοκλέα, ὅτι τοῖς προσπίπτουσιν . . . This is highly interesting, mainly because of the inclusion of Empedocles' name, but it is not supported by any manuscript. Dübner (1841) 758.16–17 has a suggestion of his own, but it does not affect my point, that Stephanus' reading was not accepted unanimously.

⁵ Teodorsson (1989) 139 notes that the doctrine that images can be gross and heavy has nothing to do with Epicurus.

equally unlikely that Plutarch used the term in this way. He was a good enough Platonist to avoid such talk.⁶

This corpuscular theory was not without antecedents and fits well into the general stance of the Peripatos in the time of Strato. The theory admitted several variations, but before examining them, it is important to determine whether σώματα denotes particles that are divided into smaller or less dense particles, or divisible masses. The latter option would be favored by those who look for Stoic elements in Hieronymus. On this view, σῶμα would stand for ὄγκος. The problem with such an explanation is that we must find the reason why an ὄγκος turns into a particle.⁷ When we are told that the σώματα coming from the object of sense are broken off (περιθραύεται) into lighter and heavier parts, then we have to admit that these fragments are corpuscles, not unarticulated masses. The text gives no clue as to how the change from a mass into a corpuscle could take place. For this reason, it is best to assume that the nature of the effluences is from beginning to end the same: they are corpuscles all along. The other difficulty concerns the size of the fragments broken off from the original σώματα. Again, there are two options. The fragments are either smaller in size than the σώματα, or they are of the same size but less dense and able to contract. Thus the fragments fit into the pores either by getting smaller and losing their rough parts, or by becoming more flexible, if they can contract. For the moment, we can postpone answering the question, but we should be clear that the text allows for either assumption. The particles streaming from the object are initially big and dense (μεγάλα καὶ παχυμερή, 10.4); but later on they become subtle (λεπτὰ, 10.8).

Two generations earlier, Heraclides of Pontus became a student of Aristotle. It is not certain that he ever belonged to the Lyceum; his acquaintance with Aristotle may have dated back to the time when both were members of the Academy. But there is a distinct possibility that he attended Aristotle's courses after Plato's death.⁸ His philosophy,

⁶ For example, in the *Table Talks* he uses the term only to mean "kind" or "form"; see 719D, 731C, 732E, 744D, 746C–F, 748B.

⁷ I use ὄγκος to mean mass—as it often does. I do not claim that this is its meaning everywhere in the texts of the philosophers of that age. In Epicurus *Ep. Her.* 52–3 the term refers to atoms.

⁸ See fr. 3 Wehrli, which says that in Athens he παρέλαβε πρῶτον μὲν Σπευσίπῳ . . . καὶ ὕστερον ἤκουσεν Ἀριστοτέλους. The sentence may well refer to the conditions in the Academy after Plato's death. I believe that ἀκούειν with genitive has the usual

particularly his astronomy and theory of matter, owed much to Plato, particularly to the *Timaeus*. But that does not rule out his theory having some impact on certain members of Aristotle's school. In fact, his influence on some of the Peripatetics, such as Clearchus and possibly Strato, is noticeable. There is every reason to believe that he was considered a pupil of Aristotle. Despite his Platonism of a really peculiar kind, he could influence some Peripatetics. Allegiance to a given school was personal as well as doctrinal.⁹ According to Heraclides, matter is made up of fragile elements (θραύσματα, fr. 121) or unarticulated masses (ἄναρμοι ὄγκοι, fr. 118–20).¹⁰ These masses are diverse and subject to affections. Furthermore, they must be somehow visible and homogeneous.¹¹ Heraclides may have explained sense perception in terms of streams of these elementary particles passing from the object to the sense-organ, where the particles find the pores of the sense-organ that are proper to them (fr. 122a–b).¹² Hieronymus may have relied heavily on Heraclides (as he may have done in religious matters as well; see 35, 50). An additional but slighter confirmation of this

implications; that is, we are told that Heraclides did attend Aristotle's lectures, not just hear about them.

⁹ As we see in the Old Academy as well, allegiance to a school did not mean that the members simply took over the doctrines of the founder or the scholarch, and rejected everything which came from without. Until the second century BCE, schools did not define themselves in such exclusive terms. I owe this point to David Hahm. The diversity of the Peripatos has also been noted by Gottschalk (1980) 141.

¹⁰ References to Heraclides and Strato are to Wehrli (1969a) and (1969b).

¹¹ As noted by Gottschalk (1980) 39. He also proves that the notion of θραύσματα can be derived from Plato's *Timaeus*; see 54, 140. Plato uses compounds of θραύειν to signify the process whereby particles of the four physical elements are resolved into triangles (56E4–5, 57B2), and συναμύζειν to refer to the combination of the elementary triangles to make up particles of earth (56D4–5).

¹² His theory was not forgotten. For a short overview of its influence, see Gottschalk (1980) 145–7. It is of particular interest that two centuries later the corpuscular theory was revived by Asclepiades of Bithynia, who thought not only that these corpuscles are fragile (Galen *CAM* 7 1.249 K; *Nat. Fac.* 1.13 2.39 K; see also ps.-Galen, *Int.* 9 14.698 K; Sextus, *PH* 3.32–3) and unarticulated (Galen, *CAM* 7 1.249 K; *Hipp. Elem.* 1.3 1.500 K; *Nat. Fac.* 1.13 2.39, 2.6 98 K; *Morb. Diff.* 6.840 K; *Hipp. Epid.* 17.1 2.506 K), but also that they move toward what is fine, labeled as πρὸς τὸ λεπτομερὲς φορά (Galen, *Nat. Fac.* 1.14 2.56, 1.16 67 K; *Diff. Puls.* 4.2 8.714 K; *Hipp. Epid.* 17.1 2.506 K). But it is not clear whether they consist of parts that are not homogeneous; and there is no direct contact with Hieronymus. Galen mentions the notion of πρὸς τὸ λεπτομερὲς φορά in the context of Erasistratus' theory; see Vallance (1990) 63ff.

dependence is the use of ὁμαλῶς ἐναρμόττει in 10.9, which recalls the use of the verbs ἀρμόζειν/ἐναρμόζειν in Heraclides fr. 122a–b.¹³ Light and fine corpuscles fit smoothly into the pores, without causing any pain. But an important difference is that Hieronymus did not regard these corpuscles as homogeneous. On the contrary, he thought that they consist of ingredients that differ both qualitatively and quantitatively. The corpuscles have a physical motion and behave like physical objects, though it is not clear whether their parts are homogeneous or not. Furthermore, whereas other representatives of the corpuscular theory think that particles can disintegrate as a result of colliding with each other, Hieronymus does not mention any kind of collision.¹⁴ There is no need for that. The particles coming from the object seem to disintegrate by themselves, due to the differences in weight of their ingredients. This seems to be a feature that gives Hieronymus' theory a distinctive mark. We find no similar statements in the writings or fragments of his contemporaries, including Theophrastus; and we have already seen that Heraclides did not make such a claim either.

Although Hieronymus shared with contemporary Peripatetics an inclination to explain sense-perception in terms of the interaction between material bodies, his solution to the problem may be unique. To grasp it, we have to take account of Strato's theory.¹⁵ He says that colors are transferred from the objects of sense (literally, they give the same color: συγχρόζοντ') to the intermediate air, which in turn colors

¹³ But this may rather be an allusion to Empedocles as reported in Theophr. *De sens.* 7, 9, 14–15. It does not mean that Hieronymus or Heraclides wanted to refer to Empedocles, only that there was an earlier precedent for the terminology and the doctrine. But while this argument cannot stand on its own, it might strengthen the general argument that Hieronymus drew on Heraclides. I owe this point to Han Baltussen. It is, however, possible that Hieronymus used the term to allude to Heraclides, who did use it, perhaps to hint at Empedocles, whom he respected; see fr. 76–7, 83–6, 90, 122a–b, and Gottschalk (1980) 14–22, 112–13. The link between Heraclides and Empedocles has also been discussed by Krämer (1971) 301–2.

¹⁴ Asclepiades of Bithynia (Caelius Aurelianus, *Morb. Acut.* 1.14, 105–6 Drabkin) thinks that these first principles collide and are shattered into countless fragments that differ in shape and size. There is a dispute between Gottschalk (1980) 57 and Vallance (1990) 19–21 and (1993) 696–7 as to whether Caelius distinguished two entities, atoms and corpuscles composed of them, or just qualified *atomi* as *corpuscula*. Whatever the case, it does not affect the point discussed here.

¹⁵ Repici (1988) 2–12 gives a detailed account of what happens in the soul in sense-perception. She pays less attention to the way in which colors from the object reach the sense-organ.

the sense organ (fr. 113).¹⁶ He offers a similar explanation for hearing in fr. 114. According to this view, we do not necessarily hear the voice in the way it is uttered because the tension of the blow may be relaxed. For the generation of different sounds is due not to the air that is somehow shaped, but to the inequality of the sound-producing blow. Striking a blow, like coloring, transmits a quality to another object, which in our case is the air as the medium of seeing and hearing. The air then conveys this quality to the sense-organ. The emphasis on the importance of qualities may reflect Strato's view that the principles of things are the basic qualities.¹⁷ In sum, he explains visual and auditory perception in terms of the transmission of a quality, not a corpuscle. In holding such a view, Strato stays closer to Aristotle than Hieronymus does.¹⁸ In fact, Strato may also owe much to Theophrastus on this point.¹⁹ In more general terms, however, we should not exaggerate the contrast between Strato and Hieronymus. Strato himself may also have inclined in some degree toward atomistic theories.²⁰

¹⁶ The testimony may also allow another interpretation, that colors are products of a mixture which takes place in the medium. The closest parallel is *De coloribus* 793b12–794a2. For this interpretation, see Ganson in this volume. One must note, however, that Strato speaks about colors, not light, which are carried from the sense objects to the medium. But the text also reflects Theophrastean notions, see, e.g., *De lapidibus* 49, 67; *De igne* 75 (all on 794a19–22). On the other hand, because the relevant treatises of Strato have not survived, we cannot make any comparison between *De coloribus* and Strato's texts. For this judgment, see Wöhrle (1999) 42–51.

¹⁷ See fr. 44 from ps.-Clement, *Recognitiones* 8.15. The author is not necessarily reliable, but what he says of Pythagoras and Alcmaeon does fit in with other sources. The basic qualities for Strato are the hot and the cold (fr. 45, 47–8).

¹⁸ Also note the similarities between Strato's account and *De audibilibus* 800a3–8. Sounds do not arise as a result of the air taking on a shape. Furthermore, both Strato and *De audibilibus* emphasize the importance of mechanical factors, viz. the strength and regularity of the blows. This may be a rejection of Aristotle's view in *De sensu* 446b8, but the notion of σχηματίζειν/μετασχηματίζειν is missing from Aristotle's account of hearing in *De anima* 2.8. According to Gottschalk (1968) 435–60, the text cannot be by Theophrastus. It is possibly by Strato or another Peripatetic contemporary with Strato.

¹⁹ This has been shown most recently by Todd Ganson in this volume.

²⁰ E.g., on his theory, bodies have weight not on account of the basic qualities (wet, hot, dry, and cold) but because of the different density of their matter (fr. 50). Furthermore, he might have known Epicurus from Lampsacus, where the latter had a school between 310 and 306; see Wehrli (1983) 569. References in Hero's *Pneumatica* may also show that he was influenced by the atomists; see, e.g., *Prooemium*, listed as text 1a in Gottschalk (1965), esp. 106.25–9.

Another text worth discussing is the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problemata* 12, a short treatise on pleasant smells. The work may be later than *De causis plantarum* for, as Hellmut Flashar has pointed out, it contains excerpts from Theophrastus' work and also alludes to *De odoribus*.²¹ The subject matter is connected with the second part of our fragment. Indeed, there are remarkable similarities in wording (e.g., πολλά τῶν γεωδῶν . . . συναποφέρεται in 10.13–14 recalls συναποφέρεται τὸ γεωδέξ in 907a25–6). The line of thought is also akin, but, strictly speaking, the author of *Problemata* 12 does not claim that smells themselves contain earthy elements. The only claim he makes in this respect is that there are earthy parts that are attached to the smell (συναπέρχεται τῇ ὁσμῇ in 906a33; συναποφέρεται in 907a25). Hieronymus is ambiguous on this point. When describing the alterations of smells, he admits that those earthy and coarse parts only travel with the smells, and are not inherent to them. In his discussion of sight, however, he calls the corpuscles large and dense when departing from the objects. They will become smaller and finer only when the earthy and coarse ingredients fall off. These ingredients are not incidental additions; rather they, along with the fine parts, seem to constitute the corpuscles.²² Thus we have to ask whether the second part of the testimony, which discusses smell, contradicts the discussion of sight and the sketch of sense-perception in general. To be sure, our source, Plutarch, thought that the testimony gives a single theory of sense-perception. He does not give any hint of alleged divergences between the accounts of smell and of sight. On the other hand, if we are not ready to concede that even if the wording is slightly different, we are dealing with the same theory, then we cannot rule out that Plutarch or his source connected passages from different works of Hieronymus, or from works related to Hieronymus, but overlooked the discrepancies between them.²³

²¹ See Flashar (1962) 551.

²² Thus we cannot say with Teodorsson (1989) 141 that Hieronymus simply took the Peripatetic concept of smell and extrapolated it for the visual image as well.

²³ We cannot rule out that Plutarch had first-hand knowledge of some of Hieronymus' works; see Pohlenz (1896). But in our case it is highly improbable. After all, right at the beginning of the testimony (10.1), Plutarch seems to mention that he owes this information to his brother Lamprias, who did not have access to the text of or about Hieronymus. Thus one might argue that the testimony is unreliable. However, the term περιθράβεται is telling. It does not turn up elsewhere in the *Table Talks*.

What kind of conclusions can be drawn? I think that Hieronymus' theory can be placed safely within Peripatetic tradition. There is no need to invoke direct external influences, Epicurean or other.²⁴ The corpuscular theory that we find in the testimony can be explained by reference to discussions within the Peripatos. Nothing in the vocabulary suggests direct influence from the Kepos.²⁵ Epicurean atoms are not fragile, even if they contain *minima*. Hieronymus could find the basic elements for his theory in Heraclides. And he did rely on him in religious matters (see 35, 50).²⁶ This is not to deny that Hieronymus may have drawn on other Epicurean doctrines. He seems to make some use of Epicurean conceptions of the good (18C) and the notion of ἡσυχία (23).²⁷ But there is no trace that he used such theories in the discussion of sense-perception. Thus, even if he was familiar with Epicurus' atomism, this could only have contributed to his own theory of sense-perception in a non-committal way; it did not provide any basis for his theory.

However, Hieronymus' notion of fragile particles can be traced back to the *Timaeus* via Heraclides. On Plato's account, the four physical elements can be "broken off" into elementary triangles that in turn can conjoin to build up the elements. This might contain Democritean notions. If so, Heraclides took them over and adjusted them to suit his own theory. Therefore, Hieronymus' conception resembles atomistic theories only insofar as the *Timaeus* does. Yet we can also see a unique feature in his theory. As far as our evidence goes, none of his predecessors or contemporaries claimed that these fragile corpuscles could be broken off without collision. But for Hieronymus, it is their internal tension, due to differences in weight, that makes them disintegrate. Despite the materialistic tendencies of the early Hellenistic Lyceum, no contemporaries shared his theory. Not that these early Peripatetics arrived at

And when Plutarch uses one of its cognates (θραύμα in 722A), he refers to Anaxagoras' theory that also made use of corpuscles.

²⁴ See Teodorsson p. 139–40.

²⁵ The term πόρος is very frequent in Aristotle (e.g., *De sens.* 438b24: οἱ πόροι τοῦ ὄμματος) and turns up in Plato (*Meno* 76C9, with reference to Empedocles) as well. Heraclides of Pontus also used the term; see fr. 82, 122a–b. Fr. 82 comes from Galen *De tremore* 6 (7.615 K), which reports Asclepiades' views; but the context may show that the same holds true of Heraclides (and Strato) as well. Unfortunately, there is no evidence as to which schools Hieronymus attended, if he did, before joining the Peripatos.

²⁶ But see Gottschalk (1980) 143, who denies this link. Nevertheless, the intention to write about Pythagoras as a religious figure might have come from Heraclides.

any consensus on how to account for visual perception, or sense-perception in general. Some spoke of sight issuing from the eyes.²⁸ Others thought that visual perception occurs by means of a slight motion or light entering the eyes.²⁹ But none of them supported a theory that explains vision in terms of particles streaming from the object to the sense. Hieronymus had to draw on the theory elaborated by Heraclides.

Now, this is finally the place to discuss the size and density of the particles. We have seen that the text supports two interpretations. Accordingly, in order to fit into the pores, the particles can become smaller or less dense. I do not think that we have to choose between the two options. The text allows both. We may be able to show that they derive from different sources. The particles are said to be broken off, which is an indication of Heraclides' influence, discussed earlier in this paper. The process whereby they become less dense recalls Strato's theory that things differ in weight because they differ in density (fr. 50). If we apply this theory fully to the testimony concerning Hieronymus, we may conclude that by continuously losing heavier ingredients, the particles will eventually evaporate. This could be his reason for why we cannot see an ant from a mile away.³⁰ One may ask how the ideas coming from these two sources were reconciled, if they were. But at this point we reach the limit of what can be known from the evidence at our disposal.

A plausible interpretation of Hieronymus' fr. 10 can be summarized as follows. Hieronymus reached a unified theory. He could make the same factors responsible both for the failure of sight when the object is placed on our eyes, and for far-sightedness. There is no essential difference between a case of immediate contact of an object with the eyes, where particles leap over from the object immediately to the sense-organ, and a case where the object and eyes are too close to one another. In both cases, the particles cannot get rid of their coarser constituents, which renders clear sight impossible. This interpretation allows further generalization. Sense-perception occurs by way of corpuscles passing from an object to the sense. The corpuscles are not homogeneous. Initially, they contain heavy, earthy parts, and that is why we, particularly

²⁷ As noticed also by Gigante (1999) 24–5. But see White in this volume.

²⁸ See *Problemata* 11.58; 15.6, 7, 12; 25.9; 31.8, 15–16, 19–21, 25. This may recall Plato's account in the *Timaeus*.

²⁹ See *Problemata* 31.7, 11. The issue has been investigated by Hahm (1978).

³⁰ Interestingly enough, the text does not say that the particles become smaller; instead, they become fine, subtle and clean, or grow warm (10.16–18).

in old age, cannot perceive them when we are too close to the object. These heavy parts are not flexible enough to get through the pores; they can cause physical pain. An additional factor is our age. The older we are, the less flexible our pores are. But if we keep proper distance, the corpuscles will lose their earthy ingredients and become fine. In this way, and if we are young enough, they fit into our pores.

Works Cited

- Dübner, F., ed. 1841. *Plutarchi Scripta Moralia*, vol. 2 (Paris: Didot).
- Flashar, F. 1962. *Aristoteles: Problemata physica, Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*, vol. 19 (Berlin: Akademie).
- Gigante, M. 1999. *Kepos e Peripatos: Contributo alla storia dell' aristotelismo antico* (Naples: Bibliopolis).
- Gottschalk, H. B. 1965. "Strato of Lampsacus: Some Texts," *Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society*, Literary and Historical Section 11: 95–182.
- . 1968. "The *De audibilibus* and Peripatetic Acoustics," *Hermes* 96: 435–60.
- . 1980. *Heraclides of Pontus* (Oxford: Oxford University).
- Hahm, D. 1978. "Early Hellenistic Theories of Vision and the Perception of Color," *Studies in Perception: Interrelations in the History of Philosophy and Science*, ed. P. K. Machamer and R. G. Turnbull (Columbus: Ohio State University), 60–96.
- Hubert, C., ed. 1938. *Plutarchus: Moralia*, vol. 4 (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Krämer, H. J. 1971. *Platonismus und hellenistische Philosophie* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter).
- Pohlenz, M. 1896. "Über Plutarchs Schrift περὶ ἀκοησίας," *Hermes* 31: 321–38.
- Repici, L. 1988. *La natura e l'anima: Saggi su Stratone di Lampsaco* (Torino: Tirrenia Stampatori).
- Sharples, R. Forthcoming. "Natural Philosophy in the Peripatos after Strato," in *Aristo of Ceos*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh and S. White (New Brunswick: Transaction).
- Theodorsson, S.-T. 1989. *A Commentary on Plutarch's "Table Talk,"* vol. 1 (Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis).
- Vallance, J. T. 1990. *The Lost Theory of Asclepiades of Bithynia* (Oxford: Oxford University).

- . 1993. "The Medical System of Asclepiades of Bithynia," *ANRW* II 37.1: 693–727.
- Wehrli, F. 1983. "Peripatos," in *Die Philosophie der Antike*, vol. 3, ed. H. Flasher (Basel: Schwabe).
- . 1969a. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 5: *Straton von Lampsakos* (Basel: Schwabe).
- . 1969b. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 7: *Herakleides Pontikos* (Basel: Schwabe).
- . 1969c. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 10: *Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler* (Basel: Schwabe).
- Wöhrle, G. 1999. *Aristoteles: De coloribus, Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*, vol. 18.5 (Berlin: Akademie).
- Wytttenbach, D., ed. 1797. *Plutarch: Moralia*, vol. 3.1 (Oxford: Clarendon).

8

Peripatetic Reactions to Hellenistic Epistemology

Hans B. Gottschalk

It has been said by Wilamowitz that Lyco was the scholar under whom the “Totenschlaf des aristotelischen Philosophie” began.¹ But while it is correct that the philosophical activity of the school was greatly reduced during his reign, it did not cease altogether, and it is just at this time that we find attempts to bring its teaching into line with current developments elsewhere. This did not lead to any fundamental changes of doctrine, but to modifications in its presentation, an *aggiornamento*, to use a term popular in the days of the second Vatican Council; still, it shows an awareness of what was going on and a willingness to join in debates with the other schools. Others may say something about developments in ethics; I want to focus on epistemology, where there are signs of an attempt to engage with the problems raised by the interaction of Scepticism, especially in its Academic form, with the dogmatic systems of the Stoics and to a lesser extent of the other schools.

I shall begin with a fragment of Hieronymus of Rhodes (54 = fr. 24 Wehrli) preserved by Diogenes Laertius with the title *Περὶ ἐποχῆς*, “On holding back.” This was a technical term for “suspending judgment,”

¹ Wilamowitz (1881) 83.

i.e. holding back one's assent to any proposition or sensation. The idea goes back to the second half of the fourth century, when Pyrrho refused to accept that any proposition could be more true than its contradictory, and Epicurus recommended that sensations should only be accepted as giving a true representation of the external world if corroborated by a "clear view." But the term, in its technical sense, is not firmly attested before the third century and was almost certainly introduced by Arcesilaus, who created the so-called Middle Academy by adopting a sceptical viewpoint as the official teaching of the school founded by Plato.² Arcesilaus was a contemporary of Hieronymus and arguably the most important philosopher in the Greek world at this time. There may have been some personal antagonism between them. One version of Diogenes Laertius (4.41 = Hieron. 4) tells of an occasion when "Hieronymus and his followers" (οἱ περὶ Ἱερώνυμον) attacked him at a festival; but a different version preferred by the most recent editors (Dorandi and White) suggests that they were on more friendly terms. Whatever the truth of this, it is clear that they were acquainted. Hieronymus' book *On epoche* could well have been directed against Arcesilaus' teaching.

At this point I must turn aside to deal with a complication. A papyrus fragment published in 1984 (55 = POxy 3656 = CPF 1.1.2.61) refers to a book by Hieronymus entitled Περὶ συνοχῆς, which allegedly told the story of a female student of Plato, Speusippus and Menedemus. It has been examined in detail by Marcello Gigante, who claims that the book referred to was identical with the Περὶ ἐποχῆς mentioned by Diogenes and that the papyrus has preserved its correct title.³ There is a connection between the papyrus and the only extant fragment attributed to the Περὶ ἐποχῆς, in as much as both contained some biographical information about persons connected with the Eleo-Eretrian school of philosophy, but Περὶ συνοχῆς cannot have been the title of this or any other work. Ἐποχή rapidly established itself as a technical term from the time of Arcesilaus onwards, and a book title Περὶ ἐποχῆς would have been understood by any contemporary interested in philosophy. Συνοχή can have a wide range of meanings, from the (divine)

² The fullest discussion of the evidence is still that of Couissin (1929). For more recent studies see Striker (1980) and Ioppolo (1984), with further references. A convenient selection of relevant texts has been assembled by Long and Sedley (1987) ch. 69.

³ Gigante (1986) 57–62.

“maintenance of the world-order” to “imprisonment.” The first editor of the papyrus, Peter Parsons, has enumerated most of them but was unable to choose between them; Gigante added a few more to his list but chose one which has no parallel at all in any ancient source: a metaphorical extension of “imprisonment” (a meaning itself not attested before the first century B.C.)⁴ to mean “being trapped in an intolerable lifestyle.” This explanation could hardly be understood by anyone not acquainted with modern psycho-babble, and there seems to be no way of making συνοχή by itself into a satisfactory book title. In fact, this word is nearly always found with a complement, mostly in the (objective) genitive. So we have a choice, either to read ἐποχῆς in the papyrus or to give συνοχῆς a complement, whose loss might be due to carelessness or deliberate abbreviation. If we choose the latter course, something like τῆς εὐδαιμονίας might meet the case.⁵ But whatever the truth may be about this, we are clearly not entitled to eject the meaningful title attested by Diogenes in favor of one which has no identifiable meaning in the form in which it has come down to us.

To return to the Περί ἐποχῆς, the only extant fragment (**54** = 24 Wehrli) is not very illuminating. It tells an anecdote about Phaedo, the narrator of Plato’s dialogue of that name and founder of the Eleo-Eretrian school, being sold as a slave to a brothel and rescued by Socrates.⁶ But there are two other fragments of Hieronymus, not ascribed to any specific work, which suggest that he disapproved of the sceptical approach to philosophy: **6** (fr. 7 Wehrli) comparing Timon of Phlius, one of the chief propagandists for Pyrrho, to Scythian mounted archers able to shoot both when attacking and fleeing, and **34** (fr. 20 Wehrli), where he compares those who are always interrupting lectures with irrelevant objections, to cowardly puppies which bite each other in their kennels but never attack wild animals when hunting. This image was borrowed from Plato (*Rep.* 539B), where he points out the danger of dialectic when practiced by young men who refute each other for

⁴ See Parsons (1984) 50.

⁵ This is based on Epicurus fr. 361b Usener = Aëtius 1.7.7: τὸ γὰρ μακάριον καὶ ἀφθαρτον ζῶον . . . ὅλον ὃν περὶ συνοχὴν τῆς ἰδίας εὐδαιμονίας τε καὶ ἀφθαρσίας. Usener prints ὅλον—ἀφθαρσίας widely spaced, indicating that he regards them as the words of Epicurus himself, but since the passage in which they stand is an expanded paraphrase of *KD* 1, they could have been added by a commentator or doxographer.

⁶ For parallels (not attributed to Hieronymus) see Riginos (1976) 91 n. 20. She suggests that this story may have been the model for one version of the one about the sale and redemption of Plato, but I wonder if the relationship should not be reversed.

the sheer hell of it; it would have a special point if directed against Arcesilaus, who claimed to represent the true Platonic tradition. If these fragments belong to the *Περὶ ἐποχῆς*, as I suspect, they would give us some idea of that work: a dialogue of the “comic” kind,⁷ in the spirit of Plato’s *Protagoras* or *Euthydemus*. Such a work would give opportunities for some biographical gossip—so the papyrus fragment could be accommodated, if anyone wants to do so—and could perhaps be compared to Theophrastus’ *Megarikos* (which I am inclined to identify with his *Περὶ τοῦ ψευδομένου*), from which we have a jokey anecdote about Diogenes the Cynic (511 FHS&G).

This is all we can say here about Hieronymus and his work. But there is other evidence for an attempt to update Aristotelian epistemology, although it may belong to a later date and cannot be connected with any known member of the school. Sextus Empiricus begins his refutation of dogmatic philosophies with a review of earlier opinions about the “criterion of truth” occupying more than half of his first book (*Adv. Math.* 7.27–262); the rest of the book is taken up with a systematic critique. In the review he considers all Greek schools, from the Presocratics to the Stoics, one by one; the Peripatetics are squeezed in between the Epicureans and the Stoics.⁸ My main concern in the rest of this paper will be to determine what doctrine Sextus ascribes to the Peripatetics in these paragraphs and how it is related to such of their works or fragments as are extant today.

Sextus begins with a short introduction (217–18) in which he says that “Aristotle and Theophrastus and the Peripatetics in general” postulated two “criteria,” corresponding to the two kinds of entity making up the universe, sensation for sensible objects and intellection (νόησιν) for intelligible ones, and in addition, common to both the others, the “plainly evident” (ἐναργές),⁹ “as Theophrastus said.” Of the other two, sensation is first in time, but intellect (νοῦς) is first in power (δυνάμει).

⁷ For this way of classifying dialogues, see Gottschalk (1980) 6–8.

⁸ 217–26 = Theophr. 301A FHS&G; I refer to individual sentences by the lines of this edition. Cf. Huby’s commentary (1999) and her article (1989) 107–22.

⁹ This word should not be translated as “self-evident,” at least at this stage. In itself ἐναργές means no more than “clear,” particularly as applied to sensations (see the examples in LSJ), and Aristotle prefers to use periphrases like (ἀρχὴν) καθ’ ἑαυτὴν πιστὴν or πιθανὸν δι’ αὐτό to express self-evidence (*Top.* 101b21, *Rhet.* 1356b26–7); even in the second century A.D. Galen (*Opt. doctr.* 5, p. 52 K) can write ἐναργές τῷ νόῳ ἢ πιστὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. See also below at n. 18.

The central section (218–25) describes how mental concepts are built up. [1] The process begins when the senses are moved by a sensible object. [2] In the higher animals this movement gives rise, “in accordance with its clarity” (κατὰ ἐνάργειαν) to a secondary movement in the soul called memory and “imagination” (φαντασία), “memory” being of the psychic event, “imagination” of the object causing the sensory movement (301A.6–19). [3] This movement “has within itself” a third supervenient movement, “rational imagination” (λογικὴ φαντασία), coming about as a result of the subject’s judgment (κρίσις) and choice (προαίρεσις); this is called “thinking and intellect” (διάνοια καὶ νοῦς; 301A.19–33). Two features distinguish this stage from the previous one: the image (φάντασμα) it gives rise to is generalized, as when seeing an individual man leads the subject to form an image of “man” in general, and it is voluntary (ἐκούσιος), i.e. the subject can choose whether to build up such an image on the basis of the preceding sensation and non-rational, non-voluntary *phantasia*. [4] Finally νοῦς and διάνοια give rise to “insights” (ἐννοιαί) and scientific knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) and art (τέχνη), by a process of aggregation (ἄθροισμός) of mental *phantasmata* and subsumption of particulars under universals (συγκεφαλαίωσις; 301A.33–40). Insights, knowledge and art are the end-products and culmination of the process of which sensation is the beginning. [5] But the process can be short-circuited, if the subject assents (συγκατατίθεται, a Stoic term) to the non-rational *phantasia* arising directly from sensation (i.e. stage 2) without doing the thinking required by stages 3 and 4; this will give rise to “opinion” (δόξα; 301A.40–3). After this, 226 sums up: the criteria of knowledge are sensation and intellect, functioning together as a tool and the craftsman wielding the tool. The judgments constituting knowledge are made by the intellect, using the senses as an indispensable tool. Τὸ ἐνάργες is not mentioned in this paragraph.

Reading through these pages, two features strike us immediately. The language belongs firmly to the Hellenistic age, with Stoic influence predominating, but includes some expressions (e.g. the word κριτήριο) first attested for Epicurus and his school.¹⁰ Also the whole piece falls into three distinct sections: 217–18, 218–25 and 226. The central section has close parallels in Aristotle’s writings, notably the last chapter of the *Posterior Analytics* (especially 99b34–100b5) and the first

¹⁰ See Huby (1999) 95.

chapter of the *Metaphysics* (980a27–981a30), where Aristotle describes how knowledge arises from sensation. There as in Sextus, the process has four stages; the first two, sensation and memory, are the same, but the third is called “experience” (ἐμπειρία), not λογική φαντασία. This is something older than Aristotle; at 981a4 he refers to Polus (as reported by Plato, *Gorgias* 448C) as his source, but the idea could be even older. Last come art and knowledge or science. Both writers connect different stages of this process with the capacities of different kinds of animal: all animals capable of self-movement have sensation, some have memory and *phantasia*, a few can build up their memories into experience (this is only mentioned by Aristotle), only humans can have knowledge or art. This line of thought is given more prominence by Aristotle, whereas Sextus’ references to it are so brief that Aristotle’s account is needed to elucidate them.

Another feature common to both is a certain vagueness as to the character of the experience and knowledge which this process yields: does it lead to the formation of concepts or propositional knowledge? The evidence for Aristotle is ambiguous; it is most natural to read the account in the *Analytics* as being about concept-formation, but in the *Metaphysics* (981a7ff.) Aristotle mentions the notion (ὑπόληψις) that “Kallias (and others) when suffering from this disease benefited from this treatment” as an example of the content of “experience.” Sextus’ account seems to fit concept-formation better; in this as in other ways it is closer to the *Analytics* than the *Metaphysics*.

These parallels are enough to demonstrate the ultimate source of Sextus’ account. They are corroborated by details like the assumption that sensation is prior in time, but intellection superior in power (218) or the distinction between possibility and actuality used to describe the relationship between *dianoia* and *nous* (222; we must of course understand that *dianoia* is a second potentiality or ἔξις). But Sextus’ author has added something Aristotle left vague in the *Analytics* and *Metaphysics*, an attempt to describe the mechanism by which knowledge is built up from sensation. Here the fundamental concepts are *phantasia* and *dianoia*. Both have their roots in Aristotle’s teaching, but Sextus’ account goes beyond his in some respects.

I shall begin with *phantasia*. Aristotle was the first to give this concept a central place in his theory of cognition and devoted a good deal of space to it in *De anima* and *Parva naturalia*. He tells us that it is a

movement caused by the senses when fully actualized,¹¹ belongs to the same “faculty” (δύναμις) as sensation, has particularly close links to the “common sense,” and is the basis of memory. Aristotle insisted on the connection with the senses because *phantasia* is found in many animals as well as humans (*Mem.* 449b30ff.); and in the *De motu animalium* (701a29ff.), he says that it is what gives rise to desire (ὄρεξις) in non-rational creatures, while intellection (νόησις) does so in rational ones. But it is also a prerequisite for thinking. The soul cannot think without a φάντασμα (*De an.* 431a16, cf. 432a8, *Mem.* 449b31); φαντάσματα “are present to” the intellective soul (τῇ διανοητικῇ ὑπάρχει, 431a14), a substrate, as it were, for its activity. There are even two passages where he makes a distinction between αἰσθητική and λογιστική or βουλευτική φαντασία (433b29 with Ross [1961] on 434a7); these may look like a precedent for Sextus 221, but here we must tread carefully. Aristotle makes this distinction in a context where he is concerned with the motives of human and animal action; these are always two, desire (ὄρεξις) and a cognitive faculty which may be sensation, *phantasia* or reason (*Mot. an.* 701a29, cf. *De an.* 433a9). A few lines after mentioning βουλευτική φαντασία, he points out that it is only found in rational creatures because deciding between two courses of action is the function of (practical) reasoning (λογισμός, 434a8). So “rational *phantasia*” turns out to be nothing more than the one *phantasia* which all rational beings have, when it subserves the mind in making rational decisions; it is neither an independent agency nor identical with any form of reasoning. In Sextus’ account λογική φαντασία is distinct from and supervenes on the non-rational one, but its exact status is left unclear. At the beginning of 221 (301A.19ff.) he says that its movement is contained within that of non-rational *phantasia* and supervenes upon it; this would imply that it is generated from non-rational *phantasia* in much the same way as the latter is generated from sense-perception. But then we are told that it is

¹¹ ὑπὸ τῆς κατ’ ἐνέργειαν αἰσθήσεως γινομένη κίνησις (*Insomn.* 459a18, cf. *De an.* 428b13); this is identical with Sextus 219 ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ ἐνάργειαν περὶ τὴν αἴσθησιν κινήσεως ἐπιγίνεται . . . μνήμη τε καὶ φαντασία, except for reading ἐνέργειαν instead of ἐνάργειαν. The original definition found its way into Arius Didymus fr. 16 Diels and Alexander *De an.* 70.2, attributed to Aristotle alone in both cases, and Priscian *Solut.* 59.22. If Sextus’ text is correct, therefore, the change to ἐνάργειαν must be due to him or his immediate source.

produced by a deliberate judgment involving two intellectual faculties, *dianoia* and *nous*. A few lines later (301A.26–30) this is described as a process akin to painting or modelling, in which the mind, by a voluntary act, forms a universal concept, e.g. man, after seeing a particular man, e.g. Dion; the simile may have been suggested by Aristotle, *Mem.* 450a2 (see below).

As a description of how the intellect uses *phantasia* as the basis of its own activity, this is close to Aristotle's teaching, but it raises some problems. First, what can be meant by saying that the rational *phantasia* is contained in the movement of non-rational *phantasia*, and also that it comes about as a result of the subject's judgment and choice (221 *init.*)? The incoherence of these sentences is not ameliorated by the following ones (301A.23ff.), where the stages of the process are gone through again one by one: the appearance of a clearly perceptible object, its action on the sense-organ whose passive movement (πάθος) gives rise to a (non-rational) *phantasia* in the soul; this is now said to be identical with memory, a trace left by the original sense-perception, comparable to a footprint. At this point a new factor is introduced: it is no longer suggested that the rational *phantasia* simply emerges from the non-rational one; rather, the subject, by a voluntary act, fashions a *phantasma* which is a mental picture, not of an individual, but of a universal such as "generic man." The inconsistency between these explanations implies an underlying confusion. But we have two clues as to how it may have arisen. As we have seen, λογικὴ φαντασία occupies the same place in Sextus' account as "experience" (ἐμπειρία) in Aristotle's, and in 222 he compares the creation of such a *phantasia* to painting or making a sculpture. This analogy is close to one used by Aristotle at *De memoria* 450a2ff., where he says that thinking cannot take place without a *phantasia*; when we think about anything, we visualize that object, just as we draw a diagram when thinking about a geometrical problem. Here Aristotle is concerned not with how we form concepts from visual images, but how we use previously formed images when thinking about objects not immediately present to our senses. The incoherence of Sextus' text and the otiose repetition could be due to his confusing these activities, perhaps as a result of compressing his source excessively. He or his source may also have been influenced by the Stoic insistence that assent to any *phantasia* is voluntary.

In the following paragraph, the distinction between *dianoia* as a capacity for thinking and *nous* as its full actualization seems to echo

Aristotle's distinction between the "passive" and "active" reason (νοῦς τῷ πάντα γίνεσθαι and νοῦς τῷ πάντα ποιεῖν, *De an.* 430a14), but Sextus appears to regard them as two aspects of the same thing, not as different entities. The use of the word διάνοια to designate the "passive" reason is un-Aristotelian and justified by a pseudo-etymological connection with δύναμις. This kind of argument is commonly associated with the Stoics, but Aristotle has a similar one to derive φαντασία from φῶς (*De an.* 429a3, echoed by Arius Didymus fr. 16 Diels).

In spite of these differences, we can still say that the central part of Sextus' account gives a recognizably Aristotelian picture, constructed with material drawn mainly from the *Posterior Analytics* and the *De anima*.¹² But this is not true of the opening and closing paragraphs. Here we find ourselves in the world of Hellenistic debates about the very possibility of knowledge. There is nothing like it anywhere in the Aristotelian corpus and no evidence other than this passage that Theophrastus wrote anything of the kind. On the other hand, Cicero (*Acad.* 2.113 = 302 FHS&G), speaking of Aristotle, Theophrastus and the early Academy in the same sentence, strongly implies that none of them raised questions of this kind. The very notion of the criterion, in its strong sense of something both necessary and sufficient to guarantee the truth of a percept or proposition, appears to be no older than Epicurus and did not become a central issue until the time of Arcesilaus.¹³ So there can be no doubt that the views attributed to Aristotle and Theophrastus here have been modernized; the question is what, if any, points of contact we can find with their genuine teaching.

As before, we must take each section separately. In 217–18 Sextus makes two claims. (1) All the Peripatetics held that the senses are the criterion for sensible objects and the mind for intelligible ones; and (2) Theophrastus added τὸ ἐναργές as the common criterion of both. In the closing paragraph he repeats claim (1) with one difference: the two criteria are no longer distinguished by their subject-matter but by their role in the cognitive process, sense functioning as the tool of the mind. Claim (2) is not repeated. A fuller version of the division given in 226

¹² Some of the differences from Aristotle's extant works may reflect the influence of Theophrastus. But our authorities agree that he maintained his master's teaching in essentials, although he pointed out the difficulties and raised awkward questions (ἀπορίαι) in his usual way. This problem can only be settled by a detailed analysis of Sextus' account and the Theophrastean parallels, which I hope to present elsewhere.

¹³ See Striker (1974) 57ff., Long (1978) 35ff.

is found at *Adv. Math.* 7.35 and *Pyrrh. Hyp.* 2.16. There the “rational criterion,” which is of most concern to philosophers, is subdivided into three: τὸ ὑφ’ οὗ, the agent who makes the judgment; τὸ δι’ οὗ, the instrument he uses to arrive at his judgment (his mind or sense-organs); and his act of judging itself (τὸ ὡς προσβολὴ τῆς φαντασίας), comparable to the application of the ruler to the object being measured (this third factor is called τὸ καθ’ ὃ in *Pyrrh. Hyp.* but not in *Adv. Math.*). Similar divisions of the criterion into two, three, or more parts are used by other late Hellenistic writers. The earliest philosopher to whom one is attributed is Potamo, the founder of a short-lived “Eclectic” school, known only from a brief paragraph in Diogenes Laertius (1.21); his date has been placed between the time of Antiochus of Ascalon and of the emperor Augustus. Others who use such schemes are Alcinous, Ptolemy, and Galen, although they do not all handle them in the same way.¹⁴ Their origin is unknown. They are most often attributed to a Stoic source and *Adv. Math.* 7.35 is printed as a Stoic fragment by von Arnim (*SVF* 2.107). But there is no ancient evidence to corroborate this; terms like κριτήριον and ἡγεμονικόν are part of the philosophical *koine* of the age, and their use in these contexts proves nothing. Moreover, the Stoic καταληπτικὴ φαντασία does not fit comfortably into such a scheme, since it belongs to the object being judged, not the subject.¹⁵ On the other hand, Sextus seems to have accepted it himself. Altogether it looks as if 226 is Sextus’ own comment on what he took to be Peripatetic doctrine and not something he found in his Peripatetic source.

This leaves the opening paragraphs. Accepting that Aristotle certainly, and Theophrastus probably, never thought in terms of a “criterion of knowledge,” we must again look for points of contact between their writings and the doctrine Sextus ascribes to them. In the case of sensation and intellect, this is easy enough. Aristotle held that each of the special senses is reliable in its own special field (*De an.* 418a12, 427b12, 428a11, b28, 430b29), and that knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) and

¹⁴ Alcinous *Didasc.* 4 p. 154, Ptolemy *Judic.* ch. 1, Galen *Opt. Doctr.* 4 p. 49–50 Kühn; Galen does not use the prepositional expressions ὑφ’ οὗ, etc. Cf. Striker (1974) 102ff., Long (1978) 36, and Long (1989) 157ff.

¹⁵ There is a fundamental ambiguity in the word κριτήριον, which can denote both the faculties by which people judge things and the quality of percepts or propositions which leads men to accept them as true; the distinction is clearly made by Sextus *Adv. Math.* 7.143, but ignored in practice by most who use it. Cf. Striker (1974) 52ff.

intellect (νόησις, νοῦς), but no other forms of thinking, are always true by definition (*Anal. Post.* 100b7ff., etc.). These ideas do not amount to a doctrine of the criterion, and Hamlyn has argued persuasively that such a doctrine would not have been possible within Aristotle's metaphysical framework,¹⁶ but they could have been a sufficient basis for a writer used to thinking in these terms to claim that they did.

The case of τὸ ἐναργές is more interesting, if only because it is attributed explicitly to Theophrastus. But we must begin with Aristotle, and here we have some independent evidence. In his summary of pre-Stoic logic at the beginning of *De finibus* 4, Cicero says, among other things, that Aristotle and Theophrastus "take as starting-point (*caput*) of a logically constructed argument that which they call 'plainly evident,' then follow the [due] order [of premisses], and then the conclusion is what is true in each case."¹⁷ Here *caput* must render ἀρχή and *perspicua* ἐναργή, and it is quite clear what Cicero refers to: Aristotle's well-known doctrine that the first premisses of demonstrative syllogisms must be undemonstrated, primary, and such as to be better known (γνωριμώτερα) than their conclusions (*Anal. Post.* 71b19ff.). At the highest level of generality, such premisses will be genuinely self-evident, but even at lower levels, where they have to be established by induction or dialectics, they must be what I prefer to call "plainly evident." Cicero implies that someone introduced the term ἐναργές to denote this quality, and Sextus' report allows us to say that this was almost certainly Theophrastus. His claim gains additional support from Alexander of Aphrodisias (*In Anal. Pr.* 34.15 = fr. 90A FHS&G) who tells us that οἱ περὶ Θεόφραστον regarded the conversion of universal negative propositions (a thesis fundamental to the demonstration of other rules of the categorical syllogism) to be ἐναργές without proof; but this is only true if we understand "without proof" in a narrowly technical sense, for Theophrastus used quite an elaborate argument to establish his point.

What Sextus presents us with, then, is an interesting case of Aristotle transformed: his *archai* have been transmuted into criteria. It only remains to determine who did this and when. Our first clue comes from Arius Didymus (fr. 16 Diels = Stob. 1.497), who claims that Aristotle

¹⁶ Hamlyn (1989).

¹⁷ *Fin.* 4.8: *argumenti ratione conclusi caput esse faciunt ea quae perspicua dicunt, deinde ordinem sequuntur, tum quid verum sit in singulis extrema conclusio est.*

believed mind and sensation to be the criteria, respectively, of intelligibles and sense-objects. Since Arius was reasonably careful, had no axe to grind and had access to good sources, he must represent a respectable tradition going back at least to the first half of the first century BC. Sextus' source is usually said to be the *Κανονικά* of Antiochus of Ascalon;¹⁸ but he was also Cicero's authority and Cicero, as we have seen, refused to attribute a criterion-theory to the Peripatetics. All we can say, therefore, is that this theory was foisted on to "Aristotle and Theophrastus" at some point between the time of Arcesilaus and Arius' source.

More important is the question whether this was done by a Peripatetic or a member of a different school, Stoic, Sceptic, or eclectic. Here we can only judge on a balance of probabilities, but it comes down in favor of a Peripatetic. Arius based his work on authoritative sources—this was essential to his purpose. The technique of Sextus' compiler, weaving together strands from different works of Aristotle and Theophrastus to produce a new effect while retaining close contact with the original texts, is very similar to that of Arius' ethical compendium and suggests that he had a fuller acquaintance with the writings of the early Peripatos than any outsider, even Antiochus, would have had at this time. A linguistic peculiarity points in the same direction, for Sextus' terminology is not entirely consistent. Common as it is in his writings, the word *ἐναργές* is mostly used in connection with sense-perception and the *phantasiai* arising directly from it; in 143 *enargeia*, as the property of the *phantasiai* presented by sensation, is contrasted with *logos*, the faculty which judges sense-perceptions. But in the section dealing with the Peripatetics, τὸ ἐναργές is treated as something which could belong to both sensation and thought. The same usage is found in Aristotle, who can speak of the *enargeia* of a *logos* or a syllogism (*De an.* 418b24, *Anal. Pr.* 68b36), and also in doxographic reports about Theophrastus (90A, 112B–C FHS&G), although in his case there is some doubt whether the word comes from him or the authors who cite him. It seems that the compiler could not erase all traces of his origin, however much he tried to modernize his vocabulary.¹⁹

¹⁸ See most recently Tarrant (1989) ch. 5, esp. 107ff. Contra Barnes (1989) 65. Cf. n. 19 below.

¹⁹ Tarrant (1989) 12 and n. 22–4 claims that Sextus took this "extension" of the concept of τὸ ἐναργές from the Philonian ("fourth") Academy (i.e., in Tarrant's view, Antiochus before he turned away from Philo's teaching) and attributed it to

The revised form of Peripatetic epistemology gained a certain vogue after the first century BC. While Arius reports it in an incomplete form, omitting any reference to τὸ ἐναργές, Galen and Clement of Alexandria, writing in the late second century AD, describe it fully and apparently adopt it as part of their own teaching, without attributing it to Aristotle or Theophrastus.²⁰ A more remote echo occurs in Diogenes Laertius' summary of Aristotle's logic (5.29). All these writers will have taken their information from handbooks derived, directly or indirectly, from the same one as was used by Sextus or his immediate source, and they must have regarded it as a true representation of standard Aristotelian doctrine. The Hellenistic compilation in which it originated deserves to stand beside the ethical compendium we know from Arius as one of the sources from which the generations before Andronicus, and non-specialists down to the third century AD, gained much of their knowledge of Aristotle's philosophy.

Works Cited

- Barnes, J. 1989. "Antiochus of Ascalon," in *Philosophia Togata*, ed. M. Griffin and J. Barnes (Oxford: Oxford University), 51–96.
- Couissin, Y. 1929. "L'origine et l'évolution de l'ἐποχή," *REG* 42: 373–97.
- Gigante, M. 1986. "Biografia e dossografia in Diogene Laertio," *Elenchos* 7: 7–102.
- Gottschalk, H. B. 1980. *Heraclides of Pontus* (Oxford: Oxford University).
- Hamlyn, D. 1989. "Aristotle: Standards, not Criteria," in Huby and Neal, 93–106.
- Huby, P. 1999. *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought and Influence*, Commentary vol. 4: *Psychology* (Leiden: Brill).
- . 1989. "Theophrastus and the Criterion," in Huby and Neal, 107–22.
- Huby, P. and G. Neal, eds. 1989. *The Criterion of Truth* (Liverpool: Liverpool University).

Theophrastus, apparently on his own initiative; but the evidence adduced in the text is against this. See LSJ for a clear and concise history of the word.

²⁰ Galen *Opt. doct.* ch. 4 1.49 K; Clement *Strom.* 2.4.13.2–4. On Clement see now Searby (1999).

- Ioppolo, A. M. 1984. "Doxa ed epoche in Arcesilao," *Elenchos* 5: 317–63.
- Long, A. A. 1978. "Sextus Empiricus and the Criterion of Truth," *BICS* 25: 35–49.
- . 1989. "Ptolemy on the Criterion: an Epistemology for the Practising Scientist," in Huby and Neal, 151–78.
- Long, A. A. and D. N. Sedley, eds. 1987. *The Hellenistic Philosophers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University).
- Parsons, P. J., ed. 1984. "Philosophical Biography (POxy 3656)," in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 52 (London: British Academy) 47–50.
- Riginos, A. S. 1976. *Platonica* (Leiden: Brill).
- Ross, W. D. 1961. *Aristotle: De Anima* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Searby, D. M. 1999. "Faith, the criterion of knowledge: Remarks on a definition attributed to Aristotle by Clement of Alexandria," *Acta Philosophica* 8: 333–45.
- Striker, G. 1980. "Sceptical Strategies," in *Doubt and Dogmatism*, ed. M. Schofield et al. (Oxford: Oxford University), 54–83.
- . 1974. "Κριτήριον τῆς ἀληθείας," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, phil.-hist. Kl. 2: 48–110.
- Tarrant, H. 1989. *Scepticism or Platonism?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University).
- Wehrli, F. 1968. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 6: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (Basel: Schwabe).
- . 1969. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 10: *Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler* (Basel: Schwabe).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1881. *Antigonos von Karystios*. *Philologische Untersuchungen* 4 (Berlin).

9

Lyco and Hieronymus on the Good Life

Stephen White

Cicero did not think much of the Hellenistic Lyceum. According to his designated proponent of Peripatetic ethics in *De finibus* 5, they are “superior to philosophers from the other schools” but “decline [*degenerant*] so far that they seem self-taught” (5.13: Lyco **11** SFOD, Hieronymus **11** White). Cicero’s verdict has long prevailed. Wilamowitz calls this a “Totenschlaf,” Wehrli a “Niedergang,” Moraux a “Dekadenz,” and Julia Annas concludes that the school “petered out rapidly as far as ethics was concerned.”¹ Paucity of evidence makes this consensus hard to contest, but also hard to confirm. Here I shall focus on Lyco and Hieronymus. Fragments are few and testimony meager. But close analysis will show that both were more astute, and apparently more influential, than Cicero acknowledges. His verdict, after all, is plainly tendentious. It derives from one of his teachers, the Academic Antiochus, whose blanket criticism of the Hellenistic Lyceum was meant to buttress his call for reviving what he styled the “Old Academy”—the fourth-century Platonists and Aristotelians who allegedly

¹ Wilamowitz (1881) 83, Wehrli (1969) 97, Moraux (1973) 16, Annas (1993) 413; cf. Zeller (1879) 921–46, Lynch (1972) 135–62, Gottschalk (1987) 1083. I argue for a more positive assessment in White (2002); cf. Mejer in this volume.

shared his view of the good life. Responding to Stoic arguments, Antiochus retrofitted Aristotelian ethics with an account of moral development modelled on the Stoic theory of *oikeiosis* but designed to highlight the discontinuity which that theory creates between our initial impulses and mature moral sensibility. Lyco and Hieronymus also tailored their positions to exploit and rebut rival theories. But they focused instead on the moral psychology of mature adults.

1. Lyco and Enjoyment

Both Lyco and Hieronymus engaged in the ongoing debate about the *telos* or goal of life, and both formulated eudaimonist positions. But their positions seem to verge on subjectivism. In a systematic survey of positions, Clement of Alexandria reports that Lyco characterized the *telos* as “true joy of soul” (10 SFOD), and Hieronymus as “living untroubled” (12 White). Despite the semblance of hedonism, both proposals are best explained as attempts to address basic problems in Aristotelian ethics.² Most pressing is the relation between virtue and happiness. Unlike Epicurus and the Stoics, Aristotle and Theophrastus deny that virtuous activity is sufficient for happiness. What else is required they leave unclear. If “perfect” or “complete” virtue, as Aristotle claims in *NE* 1.7, what makes virtue perfect or complete? If “adequate resources,” as he argues in *NE* 1.10, what is enough? If “unimpeded” activity, as in *NE* 7.13, what are the impediments? If “a kind of thought” (θεωρία τις), as in *NE* 10.8, then what kind? One problem looms especially large: What is the place of pleasure in a good life? All of these questions are still vigorously debated today, and it would be foolish to think that either Lyco or Hieronymus resolved any of them definitively. But it should still be instructive to reconstruct their efforts.

I shall deal with Lyco first, not because he worked out his position first—in fact, he probably did so later: his career lasted into the 220s, and we have no evidence that Hieronymus was active after 250—but because our evidence for his work is more tenuous, and in some ways more suggestive. His work in ethical theory does not appear to have had much impact. Cicero ignores his ideas entirely in *De finibus* 5, as does Clement’s survey of Peripatetic positions, though his position does

² Annas (1993) 413: “a more hedonic view of happiness”; cf. Repici (1977) 241–3, Arrighetti (1954) 120–3, Dalfino (1993).

appear in the following section on Stoics (10 SFOD).³ Yet even this meager report shows that Lyco was a eudaimonist and formulated an account of the *telos* or goal of life. And in *Tusculans* 3 (9 SFOD), Cicero ascribes to him two basic and standard Aristotelian doctrines: both a threefold division of things good and bad into those centered on the soul, the body, and external affairs, and also the primacy of the first class, one's state of soul or mind. Lyco, Cicero reports, considered misfortune and bodily ills only "small discomforts" (hence "no great ill": 3.76), but a troubled mind or soul something "bad and vicious" (*malis vitiisque*). The context points the same way: at issue is how best to treat not pain in general or physical pain in particular, but the specifically mental distress of *aegritudo*, which spans "sorrow" and "grief."⁴

The same emphasis is evident in the formula reported by Clement. The *telos*, Lyco maintained, is "true joy of soul" (10 SFOD), and the phrasing suits his Aristotelian stance. First, *χαρά* or "joy" refers to a distinctly mental state: an attitude of approval based on a rational assessment of one's circumstances, endeavors, and overall condition.⁵ Unlike sensory pleasures of the body, joy is a developed and acquired response, and it has a respectable Aristotelian pedigree. Virtue and vice, Aristotle argues in *NE* 2, are concerned with both actions and feelings; virtue and vice alike involve feeling pleasure and pain in the actions of both oneself and others. In fact, the best indicator or "sign" of virtue and vice is precisely the pleasure and pain we take in what we do: the virtuous "enjoy [*χαίρειν*] doing what they should do" whereas others tend to enjoy that sporadically and other things more (2.3 1104b4–13).⁶ This, I suggest, is also why Lyco insists on "true joy": the virtuous enjoy only what is genuinely good, whether their own actions or the actions of others, and never anything wrong or bad.⁷ Pointing the same way is the

³ Clement may have modified the sequence in his source, or the text may have been disrupted: Lyco follows "new Academics" (apparently linked to Herillus), and after him comes Critolaus (129.10), whose position is also reported (without attribution) in the previous section on Peripatetics (128.5). Clement seems to assimilate both to the Stoics: note *ναὶ μὲν*, then *χαρά* and *εὐποῦντος βίου*.

⁴ On 9 SFOD, see White (1995).

⁵ See White (2002) 76–8. Aristotle's own usage varies: *χαρά* is a "pathos of the soul" in *NE* 1105b22 and *De An.* 403a18, but orgasm in *GA* 724a1 and 727b35 (cf. French "jouir").

⁶ Cf. Arrighetti (1954) 123, Wehrli (1968) 25.

⁷ Cf. *NE* 10.5 1176a15–29, *Pol.* 8.5 1340a15.

gloss, whether Lyco's or another's, specifying joy "in honorable things" (ἐπὶ καλοῖς).⁸ This too echoes Aristotle's frequent insistence that virtuous people act "for the sake of something honorable"; they find doing what is right not onerous but inherently appealing, and since they value virtuous conduct for itself, they also tend to enjoy it, regardless how things turn out. The honorable conduct of others, for example, they admire and enjoy in every case. Even in terrible misfortune or desperate straits virtuous action "shines forth" (*NE* 1.10 1100b30–3), as Aristotle puts it, at least to others. The afflicted, of course, may not experience any joy. While Aristotle denies that grave and sustained misfortune can make the virtuous "miserable," he argues that they do not remain happy (1100b33–1101a8). In singling out joy, then, Lyco specifies the additional factor required for virtuous activity to constitute happiness. Only the virtuous *can* be happy, but even they are *actually* so only so long as they find joy in their lives.

So construed, Lyco's formula is a reasonable explication of Aristotelian eudaimonism. His emphasis on joy steers clear of hedonism because he posits objective norms as its basis: since only "true" joy counts as happiness, joy is neither the sole basis of goodness nor its ultimate standard. Lyco may also have been responding critically to Stoic and Epicurean proposals. I have shown elsewhere how his focus on joy could exploit a weak link in the early Stoic analysis of passion (n. 4). The passions, according to the Stoics, consist in false beliefs that something good or bad is present or imminent. Pleasure, for example, consists in a false belief that something good is or has occurred. But nothing, they contend, is good apart from virtue, so it is wrong to be pleased by anything else. The correct reaction to anything virtuous they labelled "joy" (χαρά), which they defined as "reasonable elation" (εὐλογος ἔπαρσις) in contrast to the "unreasonable elation" of "pleasure" (ἡδονή). But this invited sceptical challenge. Arcesilaus, in his attack on Zeno's criterion of knowledge, highlighted the gap between what is reasonable and what is true: reasonable beliefs are sometimes false.⁹ Joy in turn, as *reasonable* elation, may sometimes rest on a false

⁸ The received text appears to ascribe the phrase to an otherwise unknown Leukimos; for previous emendations, see **10** n. 3. Plausible alternatives include Lyco's homonymous nephew or his colleague Lycomedes (both named in his will, **1.69–70** SFOD), either of whom may have commented on his claims (cf. **1.106–8** SFOD).

⁹ See Bett (1989) 62–9; on the Stoic conception of "reasonable" attitudes, see Brennan (1996).

belief, so the virtuous may be mistaken in believing something virtuous is present, either in the attitudes and conduct of others or their own. The Stoic account of joy is thus liable to error or deception, and that is hardly a sound basis for a good life, at least for any theory committed to objective values, as both Stoics and Aristotelians were.

Chronological questions leave this scenario uncertain. We simply do not know when this Stoic account of “joy” as a “good emotion” (εὐπάθεια) originated. But several considerations favor a third-century origin, and hence a polemical aspect to Lyco’s formula.¹⁰ Lyco became head of the Lyceum c. 270/68, several years before Zeno died (c. 262/0) and only a year or two after Arcesilaus took over the Academy. Yet he outlived Cleanthes (c. 230/29) by several years (c. 225/4); and Chrysippus (280/76–208/4) was then over fifty and had only 20 years left to finish his over 700 works (D.L. 7.180). Lyco’s career thus starts in the wake of Zeno’s new ideas, spans the decades when Arcesilaus challenged them, and continues through most of Chrysippus’ long career. Moreover, similar conceptions of joy are attested already for Epicurus and the Cyrenaics. For both, as for the Stoics, joy is a temporary and distinctly mental state. Epicurus characterizes χαρά alongside “gladness” (εὐφροσύνη) as occurrent episodes of “kinetic” pleasure (D.L. 10.136, from *On Choices*).¹¹ “Gladness” had been distinguished much earlier by Prodicus as pleasure “from learning and thinking” in contrast to the sensual pleasures of “eating something or feeling something else pleasant in the body itself” (Plato *Prot.* 337C: A 13 DK 84).¹² For Epicurus in turn, joy is a distinctly mental pleasure just as fear is a distinctly mental distress (*Ep. Hdt.* 66), though he also contrasts joy with the “katastematic” pleasure of *ataraxia*, a stable state of freedom from anxiety which can only be varied, not increased, by the kinetic pleasures of joy and gladness (*Vat. Sent.* 81). The Cyrenaics also char-

¹⁰ Works *On Passions* are attested for Zeno (D.L. 7.4), Herillus (7.166), and Sphaerus (7.178), as well as Chrysippus (cf. *On Apatheia* by Dionysius, 7.167); the εὐπάθειαι are defined in terms of the εὐλογον, which Arcesilaus’ challenged; and all parties to the debate in *Tusc.* 3.76–8, which Chrysippus ostensibly resolved, are third-century. For reservations about chronology, see Inwood (1985) 305 n. 207, Donini (1995), Brennan (1998) 59 n. 19.

¹¹ Joy, as an emotive response, is only a temporary event or state also for the Stoics (*SVF* 3.103, 111).

¹² Cf. Arist. *Top.* 2.6 112b23–5: A 19 (naming both χαρά and two of its species in the Stoic scheme, *SVF* 3.431–4), Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.21–34: B 2, Sch. *Od.* 9.5–6, and n. 28 below.

acterize *χαρά* as a pleasure that arises not directly in bodily sensation but in the “bare” thought of something desirable (D.L. 2.89, cf. 2.98).

In equating happiness with a kind of joy, Lyco fits squarely into third-century trends. But in requiring an objective basis for joy, he steers clear of hedonism. The specter of hedonism in his formula turns on a basic ambiguity in eudaimonism. As Aristotle implies and the Stoics explain, talk about a *telos* or goal can be taken in at least two ways: either internally and prospectively as the agent’s own target or objective in deliberation and action, or externally and descriptively as an actual outcome or result achieved or attained.¹³ For hedonists, pleasure is the ultimate aim or objective in the former sense; but only if they actually get what they seek do they attain the goal in the second sense. For Lyco, by contrast, joy is the goal only in the second sense. His singling out a certain kind of joy as the *telos* does not imply that joy either is or should be our primary or sole object of pursuit. On the contrary, the reference to truth and honorable things in his formula requires the sources and objects of this joy to have objective value independent of anyone ever enjoying them. Lyco’s account of the *telos*, then, does not specify a criterion for action, a target or objective to be sought in all we do or to ground our deliberations and decisions. Rather, his formula characterizes a good life as actually attained: to attain the *telos* of human life is to find true joy. This requires living virtuously; but that is only a necessary, not a sufficient condition for a good life. What more is needed? Joy in this conduct. What does that require, and how are we to act? Here our evidence runs out. But since it matters for Lyco *what* we enjoy (truly honorable things), his is not a hedonist position. Joy is neither the sole nor the ultimate value or good; it is rather the consummation of goodness. As Aristotle puts it, a virtuous life is not only the best but also the most pleasant life (*NE* 7.13 1153b9–17, cf. 1.8 1099a24–31). The virtuous typically enjoy their conduct for itself, regardless how things turn out. They may also be distressed by some situations and events, and they may suffer. If this removes their joy, then according to Lyco, they are no longer happy. But so long as they do find sustained joy in their lives, they are happy, and they fully realize the human *telos*.

¹³ Cf. the ancient distinction between a σκοπός and the τέλος (Arius in Stob. 2.47.7–11, 2.77.1–5; cf. Arist. *NE* 1.2 1094a18–24); on its role in Stoic theory, see Annas (1993) 397–408.

2. Hieronymus and Equanimity

Our evidence for Hieronymus' stance on these issues is more extensive, but also less favorable. It comes mainly in three contexts: in lists of rival views of the *telos*; in Cicero's critique of Epicurean hedonism in *De finibus* 2; and in Plutarch's and Seneca's essays on anger. The first two contexts are closely related, highly polemical, and seriously distorting. Only the third is ostensibly favorable, though it too is tainted. First the prosecution's case. Cicero, we saw, is reluctant to call Hieronymus a Peripatetic at all, because he equated "the greatest good with absence of pain" (*Fin.* 5.14: **11**); and he ascribes much the same view to him another dozen times. Clement reports a similar view, as do a Neoplatonist excerpted by Stobaeus (apparently Iamblichus), a Roman scholar on Horace, and Plutarch. Clement even mentions him alongside Epicurus and Cyrenaics in a list of hedonists. At issue in every case is the *summum bonum* or *telos*. But some significant differences are easily overlooked.

One crucial difference is terminological. Cicero's testimony must be handled with special care, since he is translating Greek terms and does so in more than one way. Usually he speaks of *dolor* or pain: *vacuitas doloris* (**11**, **16A**, **16B**, **18C**), *dolore vacare* (**20B**), *non dolere* (**14**, **16D**, **18C**, all with *vacuitas doloris* in context; **19**), *nihil dolere* (**18A**, **19**, **20A**), even *indolentia* (**18C**). But twice, and in the two earliest of these works (*Ac.* 2 and *Fin.* 1–2), he uses a different term: *vacare omni molestia* (*Ac.* 2.131: **13A**, cf. **13B** without naming anyone) and *sine ulla molestia vivere* (*Fin.* 2.16: **18B**). The difference is real and significant. Cicero devotes Book 2 of the *Tusculans* to refuting the view that *dolor* is bad; and in *Div.* 2.2, he describes the book as *de tolerando dolore*. By this he means specifically bodily pain, due to physical injury or illness. Book 3 focuses rather on emotional distress, mainly *aegritudo*—*Div.* 2.2 describes it as *de aegritudine lenienda*—which ranges from sorrow and discontent to grief and depression; and *molestia* is one of its species (*Tusc.* 3.83), defined in Book 4 as "longlasting distress" (*aegritudo permanens*, 4.18).¹⁴ Cicero's use of *dolor* and *aegritudo* parallels the contrast between πόνοϛ and λύπη in

¹⁴ Cf. *Leg.* 1.32, where *molestia* stands for λύπη. A mental state is also implied in **15** from Stobaeus, which lists only psychic states and apparently come from Iamblichus' lost work *On Soul*.

Greek; but his use of *molestia* reflects a narrower idea. The original formula from Hieronymus that Cicero translated probably referred to neither ἀπονία nor ἄλυπία. Both Clement (12) and Iamblichus (15) single out something more specific.

Hieronymus the Peripatetic claimed that living ἀοχλήτως is the *telos*, and *eudaimonia* is only a final good; and Diodorus likewise from the same school declares that living ἀοχλήτως and honorably [καλῶς] is the *telos*. [*Strom.* 2.21 127.4–5: 12]

The rest define the desirable by a part of the honorable, either ἀοχλησία as Hieronymus does, or some other modes of conduct. [*Stob.* 1.383.8–11: 15]¹⁵

The contrast in 12 between the *telos* and a “final good” (τελικὸν ἀγαθόν) is technical and reflects a context of theoretical analysis and debate. The Stoics mark the distinction between *telos* and objectives formally by using infinitives to specify the realized *telos* of living happily, and reserving substantives for its components and causes. Actually “being happy” is the *telos*, but “happiness” is only the ultimate objective we seek to attain in all our deliberate actions; and on their account, the former is *living* virtuously, whereas the latter embraces both the virtues themselves and specific virtuous states and acts that we should aim to do or achieve because they constitute happiness.¹⁶ Like Lyco, then, Hieronymus specifies the *telos* as a way of life actually attained, not as a target or criterion for deciding what to do, which he considers only a final good and calls *eudaimonia*. But why does he distinguish this from the *telos*? His rationale, I suggest, reflects a basic disagreement between Stoics and Aristotelians. For the Stoics, only virtues and virtuous states, actions, and people are final goods; and those are the only objectives we should ever choose (in the strict sense of ἀΐρεσις; anything else we “select” or “disselect”). But Aristotelians are pluralists: the virtues and their exercise are the most important but not the only intrinsic goods; norms of virtue guide and constrain the virtuous in their deliberations and choices, but other things, like health and friends, also enter into their choices as final goods. Happiness, Aristotle argues, is the only thing “we choose always for itself and never for

¹⁵ Porphyrio in 21 correctly equates *indolentia* with ἀπονία, but wrongly conflates this with absence of *molestia* (i.e. ἀοχλησία); both *molestias* and *gaudium* there refer only to emotional states.

¹⁶ *SVF* 3.106–8. Cf. *Stob.* 2.130 and 134 for later Peripatetic use of this notion; see White (2002) 87–8.

anything else, but honor, pleasure, intelligence, and every virtue we choose both for themselves (for we would choose each of them even if nothing resulted) and also for the sake of happiness, since we expect to be happy through these" (*NE* 1.7 1097b1–5). Happiness, then, is a final good for Stoics and Aristotelians alike. But Hieronymus had reason to single it out because it embraces all other final goods, virtue included; and he rightly calls it "only a final good" because it is only a target or objective we seek and choose, not the realization of our choice in actually living happily. That Hieronymus equates with living ἀοχλήτως.¹⁷ But what is that?

His term has a distinguished philosophical pedigree, and is rarely attested in other contexts. Derived from ὄχλος, meaning a "crowd" or "mob," it suggests an absence of overwhelming pressure, being "untroubled" even by imposing opposition.¹⁸ Aristotle, for example, refers to "crowds" in the literal sense a dozen times (in *Pol.* and *Rhet.*) but uses cognates metaphorically to pick out psychological disturbances: we are "troubled" when we cannot recall something (*Mem.* 453a16); the young are "troubled" by intense appetites (*Top.* 3.2 117a33; cf. *Tim.* 43B–C); opposing or "causing trouble" to people makes them angry (*Rhet.* 2.2 1379a15, cf. 2.4 1381b15); and "bitter" anger makes people "most troublesome" to themselves and others alike (*NE* 4.5 1126a25–6). The privative term, moreover, is used almost exclusively for an absence of mental disturbance and appears repeatedly in ethical debates. Speusippus reportedly used it to refer to a neutral state "untroubled" by either pains or pleasures; and according to Clement, he contrasted the desire (ὄρεξις) everyone has for happiness with the "aim" (στοχάζεσθαι) only good people have for ἀοχλησία (*Strom.* 2.22 133.4).¹⁹ Epicurus also used it and cognate forms, all of ten times in his scant remains. In *Ep. Men.*, he dismisses fear of death as "pointless" on the ground that "what causes no trouble [ἐνοχλεῖ] when present causes empty pain in anticipation" (125); and he distinguishes three classes of desires as "necessary": "for happiness, or for the body's

¹⁷ The noun ἀοχλησία in **15** picks out the persisting state that underlies this way of life.

¹⁸ Plato uses the noun ὄχλος over 40 times, mostly literally, but cognates a few times metaphorically for "troublesome" (*Rep.* 569A7, 590B7, *Hip. Min.* 295B6).

¹⁹ See F 77–84 Tarán. According to Alexander, *De anima* 150.34–5, ἀοχλησία was the πρῶτον οἰκεῖον for the Megarics (Stilpo 2 O 34 SSR 1); cf. Stob. 2 47.17–20 (parallel with Cic. *Fin.* 5.18), Sen. *Ep.* 92.6.

ἀοχλησία, or for life itself" (127).²⁰ *KD* 8 claims that some sources of pleasure cause "troubles much greater than their pleasures"; and *Vat. Sent.* 79 claims that "an undisturbed person [ἀτάραχος] is no trouble [ἀόχλητως] to himself or others." Being "trouble-free" is thus a goal for both the hedonist Epicurus and the anti-hedonist Speusippus. It is even endorsed by Chrysippus, who supported the Stoic thesis that virtue is sufficient for happiness by arguing that the virtuous "scorn all that people mistakenly believe [δοκοῦντων] troublesome" (D.L. 7.127–8: *SVF* 3.49 from *On Choices*; cf. Orig. *C. Cels.* 8.51: *SVF* 3.474 from *On Passions*).

Most of this evidence, though preserved in late sources, comes from third-century or earlier works. It shows both that the term ἀοχλησία was current then and that it referred to some sort of absence of mental troubles or equanimity. Whether Hieronymus himself adopted the term to specify the *telos* is uncertain. But provided it accurately reflects his views, we can begin to see how he fits into contemporary debates. Like the *ataraxia* of Epicurus (and some Pyrrhonists),²¹ his formula may set the standard for happiness lower than Lyco does; a privative state of "living untroubled" seems to fall short of a positive state of joy. It may also set a lower standard than Epicurus, who requires additionally the absence of bodily distress designated by ἀπονία. In fact, the Stoic definition of the passion "troubledness" (ἐνόχλησις or ὄχλησις), which probably reflects third-century usage, suggests an even lower standard. "Being troubled" was classified as a species of sorrow (λύπη) and defined as "sorrow that confines and gives no respite" (so [Andron.] 2: *SVF* 3.414) or "is hard to escape" (D.L. 7.112: *SVF* 3.412). Both formulations are echoed in Cicero's definition of *molestia* as "longlasting sorrow" (*Tusc.* 4.18: *SVF* 3.415). If Hieronymus had something like this in mind, then his *telos* of "living untroubled"—ἀοχλήτως or *sine molestia*—requires only freedom from lasting and disabling mental distress.²²

This interpretation gains support from Cicero's references to Hieronymus in his critique of Epicurean hedonism in *Fin.* 2. One of Cicero's main charges is that Epicurus equivocates about the very thing

²⁰ Although the body is here the source and primary locus of "trouble," the "trouble" itself is the psychic distress of unfulfilled needs and any resulting worry or anxiety; cf. F 34.32.4 Arrighetti (from *De Nat.*), and F 37, 134, 432, 450, 526 Usener.

²¹ Cf. Dalfino (1993) 294–8.

²² Cf. Arist. *NE* 1.9–10, esp. 1101a6–13.

he values most: he conflates physical sensations of pleasure with mental states of enjoyment and satisfaction—roughly, pleasant stimulation of the body and senses, as in eating or sex, with the mental joys of hearing good news or talking with friends. Cicero tries repeatedly to drive a wedge between the pleasure Epicurus says motivates both humans and other animals initially—our instinctive or innate attraction to pleasant sensory stimulation—and the pleasure he makes the basis of a good life—an absence of either physical distress or mental anxiety that he called *ἀπονία* and *ἀταραξία*. The former, Cicero claims, everyone calls pleasure, but the latter is something else entirely; far from being pleasure, it is simply an absence of pain (*Fin.* 2.8: **18A**). Epicurus, in short, is philosophically disingenuous, and Cicero insists he choose between the frank hedonism of the Cyrenaics, who make particular episodes of pleasure and satisfaction the *telos* (what Epicurus called “pleasure in motion” or kinetic pleasure), and the timid pseudo-hedonism of Hieronymus.

Whether Cicero’s critique is sound is irrelevant here, though I do think it misguided.²³ All that matters here is what it can tell us about Hieronymus. Cicero assimilates his position to Epicurus’ account of the *telos* as a stable “katastematic” state of satisfied physical needs and equanimity, or *ἀπονία* and *ἀταραξία*. Prevailing usage of *ἀοχλησία* confirms that this is at least roughly accurate. But here the similarity stops, as the rest of Cicero’s critique shows. For Epicurus, but not for Hieronymus, this state of satisfaction is also the proper target and criterion for rational choice and deliberation. Epicurus makes this second move for essentially two reasons. First, he holds that all pleasure is inherently good and attractive, and second, he recognizes that some pleasures involve needless or excessive pain. In those cases, he directs us to avoid what we naturally find pleasant in order to maintain *ἀπονία* and *ἀταραξία*. We are to forego the pleasure of another drink, for example, if and only if it has unpleasant effects that will disrupt our overall satisfaction. But Hieronymus rejects his crucial first premise. According to Cicero, at any rate, he denies that pleasure is inherently good in the first place: *negat esse eam* [sc. *voluptatem*] *propter se*

²³ See Striker (1993), esp. 208.

²⁴ Cicero or his source may exaggerate here; and the claim he ascribes to Hieronymus is only that pleasure is not intrinsically good, not that it has no value at all. Chrysippus similarly concedes (to “Aristotle” among others) that virtue would not be undermined if pleasure is “good” but not a *telos* (Plut. *Sto. Rep.* 1040C–F: *SVF* 3.23–4).

expetendam (*Fin.* 2.9: **18A**).²⁴ He thus rejects the very point of Epicurus' prudential advice, which is to maximize pleasure by avoiding unnecessary pain. But if pleasure is not a target or criterion for choice, then neither is the avoidance of "trouble"; "living untroubled" is rather the *telos* in the sense of the best life, as I suggested earlier.

Hieronymus, I suggest, held a position similar to one Aristotle sketches in *NE* 7.13. Against Speusippus, who held that a neutral state is best because both pain and pleasure are bad, Aristotle argues that the best good is in fact a kind of pleasure.

Presumably, if in fact every state has unimpeded activities, and either the activity of them all or the activity of one of them, if unimpeded, is happiness, then it is even necessary for this activity to be most desirable; but this [viz. some unimpeded activity] is a kind of pleasure. Hence some kind of pleasure would be the best good, even if it turns out that most pleasures are bad on their own. [1153b9–14]

It does not follow, and we know that Aristotle denied, that we do or should take pleasure as either our immediate or our ultimate objective or aim. Aristotle is neither a psychological nor an ethical hedonist. His point is rather that happiness consists in some form of unimpeded activity, and since pleasure also consists in unimpeded activity, happiness is bound to be pleasant. But our ultimate aim is activity of some kind. If we perform the right activity in the right state, and if our activity is unimpeded, then we attain that aim and are happy. But we cannot choose or decide to be unimpeded; all we can choose is activity of more or less specific types.²⁵ Similarly, I suggest, Hieronymus proposed "living untroubled" not to specify what we do or should seek or choose as our ultimate aim, but rather to identify a further condition our activity must fulfill for anyone to attain our *telos*. Activity of the right sort, if unimpeded and untroubled, counts as happiness.

Hieronymus was not a closet hedonist. But to see how he was made to look like one requires a brief detour into source criticism. Much of our evidence for his position derives from a ninefold classification of views about the *telos* used by the Academic Carneades to undermine Stoic ethics. This lies behind the reports in Clement and Stobaeus as

²⁵ Not only is the absence of trouble or impediment not directly within our control, it is also simply too vague to be an object of deliberation or choice; cf. Striker (1993) 206–7 on *ataraxia* as an "objectless" state.

²⁶ A caveat: our evidence for this "Carneadean division" comes via Antiochus, who Cicero says used it *libenter* — frequently or freely (*Fin.* 5.16).

well as many of Cicero's.²⁶ The basis of this scheme is a pair of three-fold distinctions. Carneades first isolated three different primary objects of desire: pleasure, absence of pain, and "the primary natural things" (both physical traits like health, strength, and a sound body, and mental aptitudes: *Fin.* 5.18). He then contrasted three distinct ways of taking each of these to define the *telos*: simply having it, or having it together with virtue, or simply seeking it methodically regardless whether or not we actually attain it. Cicero assigns champions to seven of these views. The Cyrenaics adopted pleasure alone, Hieronymus absence of pain, and Carneades the primary natural things (though only as a devil's advocate); Callipho combined virtue with pleasure, Diodorus with absence of pain, and "the Old Academy" of Aristotle and others with the primary natural things. Only the Stoics ventured to adopt one of the third approaches, namely "doing everything to obtain and maintain the primary things, whether or not you get them." So formulated, the division makes the Stoic position look absurd, and both Carneades and Aristotelians more plausible. Yet, as Cicero reports in *Acad.* 2.138 (**13B**), this ninefold scheme is based on an earlier Stoic strategy used by Chrysippus, who focused on only three positions.²⁷

Chrysippus often affirms that there are only three views about the final good that can be defended; he prunes away and cuts out many more: either virtue is the end, he says, or pleasure, or both. After all, those who hold that the greatest good is being free from all trouble [*molestia*], he says, avoid the unpopular [*invidiosum*] name of pleasure but inhabit its neighborhood. So too, he says, those who combine pleasure with virtue do the same; nor do those do much different who join the primary attractions of nature to virtue. Thus he leaves three views that he thinks can be reasonably defended.

Chrysippus, who deployed this threefold scheme in his polemic against hedonism, is evidently the one who pigeonholed Hieronymus as a latent hedonist. His choice of target indicates that he considered Hieronymus a major rival, as did his successor Zeno of Tarsus (witness his five books *Against Hieronymus*: **24**). But Cicero's reference to his "pruning and cutting" is a warning that he may have been misconstrued or even distorted rival views. His strategy can be traced back to Prodicus' parable of Heracles choosing between Virtue and Pleasure

²⁷ See Algra (1997) 109–20 on Chrysippus, 130–8 on *Acad.* 2.138.

(Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.21–34: B 2 DK 84).²⁸ It drives the central argument of Plato's *Gorgias*, and from the perspective of Stoic rationalism, also the contest between pleasure and knowledge in the *Philebus*. It even frames Clement's catalogue of positions: first the hedonists, mainly Epicurus and Cyrenaics; then the Aristotelian compromise; and finally Stoic rationalism. There, of course, Hieronymus is out of place, among the hedonists, not the Peripatetics.²⁹ Cicero explains why. Chrysippus argued that the difference between pleasure and "absence of trouble" (note *molestia*) is largely verbal—"they avoid the unpopular word"—and minimal in fact—they "inhabit the same neighborhood."³⁰ But vicinity is not identity, as the contrast with Epicurus shows. Hieronymus was no hedonist.

There may be another dimension to this Stoic critique. Plutarch, in his own polemic against the Stoics, assimilates Hieronymus to Epicurus on other grounds. Context is crucial here. Plutarch accuses the Stoics of pervasive inconsistency. Most of his examples are doctrinal, claiming one thing in one work and contradicting it elsewhere. But he begins his essay with the classic *ad hominem* charge of preaching one thing and practicing another. In their writings, he charges, Zeno, Cleanthes, and Chrysippus all extol the active life of public service and government; yet in their own careers, they shunned such endeavors in favor of intellectual pursuits. Their choice, he concludes, befits proponents of "the quietude [ἡσυχία] which Epicurus and Hieronymus praise," but not the Stoics, and especially not Chrysippus, who argued "in the fourth book of *On Lives* that the scholarly life differs not at all from the hedonist's" (*Sto. rep.* 1033B–C: **23**). It would be wrong, I think, to put much weight on the term ἡσυχία, as some have done.³¹ The context is rhetorical, not technical, and focused directly on the Stoics. But Plutarch goes on to quote a passage from Chrysippus (*SVF* 3.702) which bears out the point of his contrast. Chrysippus isolates pleasure as the underlying motive for "the scholastic life"; and he assimilates the "untroubled life" of Hieronymus to hedonism. The context in Plutarch

²⁸ Xenophon, whose Socratic works Zeno admired (D.L. 7.2), puts it in Socrates' mouth; cf. n. 12 above.

²⁹ The formulation recalls views of Antiochus' "Old Academy," especially the anti-hedonism of Speusippus (see n. 19 above; cf. *Philebus* 44).

³⁰ Posidonius F 187, reporting the same trichotomy, also highlights ἀσχλησία without naming Hieronymus; cf. Sen. *Ep. Mor.* 92.6.

³¹ Wehrli (1969²) 31, Arrighetti (1954) 120–1, Dalfino (1993) 294–5. Cf. **23** n. 3.

makes it very likely that the two moves are connected. Hieronymus, in short, probably favored a “scholastic life” as the highest ideal.³² If this was his view, then he again had precedent in Aristotle, whose case for intellectualism remains a live issue today. Unlike the Stoics, moreover, Hieronymus would be consistent, both advocating and living the life of teacher, scholar, and philosopher.

One other issue will complete our picture. Hieronymus, in a work Plutarch claims to know and admire, provided “useful remarks and advice” about anger (25: *Coh. ira* 454F). Pohlenz even argued that Hieronymus was the main source for Plutarch’s essay on anger.³³ Be that as it may, Plutarch’s two explicit citations bear directly on our discussion. One draws on Aristotle’s account of anger as a painful desire for retribution or punishment (τιμωρία).³⁴ Plutarch, after emphasizing how badly anger distorts our judgment, directs us to render justice only when we are calm and fully rational, never in the heat of passion—either pain of resentment at slights or wrongs, or pleasure in satisfying a desire for revenge.

We should rather impose the penalty [δίκην] without either pain or pleasure when reasoning is in control, leaving no provocation for our temper [τῷ θυμῷ]. Now this may appear to be not a remedy for anger [οὐκ ὀργῆς ἰατρεία] but a delay and protection against making mistakes when angry. Yet, while swelling in the spleen is a concomitant [σύμπτωμα] of fever, calming [πραυνόμενον] the swelling also alleviates the fever, as Hieronymus says. [460C: 26]

Plutarch’s worry here is that anger makes us misjudge first what others have done, and then how we should respond. We exaggerate both

³² Cf. Algra (1997) 113–14. Chrysippus evidently favored a “rational life” that unites both “intellectual” and “practical” lives (D.L. 7.130: *SVF* 3.687).

³³ Pohlenz (1896), answered by Rabbow (1914); cf. Arrighetti (1954) 112–16. An independent essay, though unattested, is likely. Bion wrote one in the first half of the third century (T 10 Kindstrand), Theophrastus wrote *On Passions* and also *On Punishment* (F 436 no. 5 and 22 FHS&G) and catalogues of Aristotle’s works include a title *On Emotions – Anger* (D.L. no. 37, Hesych. no. 30). Anger and calm are the first emotions discussed in *Rhet.* 2; all three ethical works analyze the corresponding virtue of calmness (*NE* 4.5, *EE* 3.3, *MM* 1.22); and a corresponding form of akrasia is singled out for discussion in *NE* 7.6. Anger was also a prominent topic for rival schools; for example, it regularly heads Stoic lists of *epithumiai* (*SVF* 3.394–5, 397–8).

³⁴ *Rhet.* 2.2 1378a30–2; cf. *De An.* 403a30–1. The fuller formulation in *Rhet.* 2.2 defines anger as a mixture of pain and desire (ὁρεξίς μετὰ λύπης).

their wrong and therefore also what they deserve in response. But that reduces punishment to retaliation, returning wrong for wrong. Anger thus makes us liable to act wrongly and unjustly ourselves. One way to avoid this, he suggests, is simply to wait: rather than respond to perceived slights or wrongs immediately, while we are still angry, we should wait until we calm down and are no longer angry. Waiting, he concedes, is not a “remedy for anger”; it does not eliminate anger from our lives, as the Stoics contend we should do. But it does change our behavior: we may still get angry but we will make fewer mistakes when we do. To support this approach, Plutarch then cites a medical analogy from Hieronymus. Comparing anger to a fever, he prescribes treatment not for the fever itself but for one of its symptoms or concomitant effects. His analogy is subtle and deceptively complex. Its crucial term is the swollen spleen; but what is its analogue in anger? The spleen was closely associated with the liver: the liver cleans the blood by filtering out impurities, and the spleen helps clean out the liver itself; it does this by collecting excess impurities from the liver, which then cause the spleen itself to swell.³⁵ Now the liver, as the source of bile, was widely associated with anger, and a swollen spleen with excessive anger. What Hieronymus prescribes, then, is not to treat the liver directly, nor to treat the spleen directly, but simply to wait for its swelling to subside. The swelling indicates—is a “symptom” of—an underlying inflammation in the liver; but it also indicates that the spleen is performing its natural function, eliminating the impurities causing the inflammation and fever. The proper treatment, in short, is no treatment at all; we should simply wait for the spleen to complete its task.

If we apply this to the case of anger, the underlying inflammation in the liver represents the pain of a perceived wrong or slight, the swelling of the spleen represents a desire for retribution, and the two together constitute the complex state of anger. Hieronymus thus seems to endorse the Aristotelian analysis of anger as a mixture of pain and desire.³⁶ In proposing not to do anything about the swelling, moreover, he recom-

³⁵ Cf. Plato *Tim.* 72C–D, Arist. *PA* 3.4, 3.7, and Hippocratic parallels listed in **25** n. 1.

³⁶ Cf. n. 34. If the swelling is only a symptom of fever, then pain is the primary factor in anger and desire only a concomitant. This contradicts the Stoic account of anger solely as a species of *epithumia* (hence unreasonable and excessive desire): “an *epithumia* for punishing one believed to have done wrong” (*SVF* 3.395–8). For a further disagreement over the intentional object of anger, see **25** n. 2.

mends not acting on a desire for retribution, at least until we calm down. Only then, when our minds are calm, should we respond to any wrong. This in turn implies that at least some “symptoms” of anger are both natural and functional. What he thought these might be we have no evidence to say. But his analogy does imply that it would be wrong to take radical measures against them, or to try to eliminate them. The correct course is rather to “calm” our desire for retribution. That, of course, is the term Aristotle adopts for the virtue concerned with anger: the mean in feeling anger and acting accordingly is *πρότης* or “calm” and the virtuous are *πράοι*. But for Aristotle, there is a vice of deficiency as well as of excess: not only “irascibility” (*ὀργιλότης*) but also “inirascibility” (*ἀοργησία*). Excessive anger and angry acts are much more common, but we can also avoid them too much: feel angry too little or too rarely and do too little when punishment or similar responses are warranted. In recommending the tactic of delay, then, Hieronymus adopts an Aristotelian position on the value of anger, just as his medical analogy suits an Aristotelian analysis of its nature.³⁷

This view of anger links up neatly with Hieronymus’ account of the *telos*. To live “untroubled” is in part to live “calmly”: free of excessive anger and excessive reactions to perceived wrongs and slights. His point is not that anger and its underlying distress and desires are to be eliminated entirely, simply that anger must not impede our lives by “troubling” our thoughts and feelings or leading us to do wrong.³⁸ Seneca’s one explicit mention of Hieronymus illustrates this point nicely. In his treatise on anger, which is addressed to his older brother shortly before he was appointed governor of a Roman province in Greece,³⁹ he decries the way anger can pervert justice, especially in officials responsible for passing judgment and imposing penalties.

[Reason punishes] without clenching its teeth or shaking its head or doing anything unbecoming a judge, whose face should be calmest and steadiest [*maxime placidus et in statu*] when he delivers important judgments. “What help is it,” says Hieronymus, “when you want to strike someone, to bite your own lips first?” [*De ira* 1.19.3: 27]

³⁷ Cf. Repici (1977) 242, who relates Hieronymus’ views to virtuous moderation.

³⁸ Aristotle calls “bitterly” angry people “troublesome” to both themselves and others (*NE* 4.5 1126a25–6).

³⁹ See 27 n. 2.

Seneca's primary concern is with the injustice of retaliation, of the wrong committed by a punisher who is too severe due to anger. But here he illustrates how anger causes needless distress even for the punisher. It is not only pointless but foolish and self-injurious for a judge to hurt himself. Rather than "bite your own lips"—or rend your own clothes, smash your own property, pull your own hair, and beat your own body, Seneca continues—it is in our own best interest to act calmly and steadily.⁴⁰ Seneca favors eliminating anger entirely. But the example he borrows from Hieronymus favors only remaining calm, not avoiding anger completely.⁴¹ The context also suits the tactic of delay we found in Plutarch. Judges, provided they are not parties to a case, are distanced from the events that could incite anger, as delay affords distance also for the angry. Seneca also goes on to explain why anger is liable to hurt the angry themselves: "since it cannot erupt against others as quickly as it would like, it turns on itself" (1.19.4). Or in the terms of Hieronymus' analogy in **26**, a swollen spleen hurts the angry people themselves because it takes time to perform its proper function. This problem of timing brings us to our last text.

Plutarch's first explicit citation from Hieronymus concerns a dispute about how quickly anger can arise. Hieronymus considers it a sudden reaction, but Plutarch objects that its origin is all too obvious.

One who gives no wood to a fire puts it out, and likewise one who does not feed anger initially or fan his ire protects himself and puts it out. So I do not agree with Hieronymus, though he has other useful remarks and advice, when he says that we perceive anger not while it is beginning but due to its speed only after it has begun and is already underway. For no other emotion, while it is gathering and getting underway, is so obvious in its beginning and growth. [454E–F: **25**]

There are two distinct issues here. One is a general problem about precipitous judgment and impetuous action. The other involves the difference between incipient and full-fledged anger. The Stoics (and others)

⁴⁰ Procopé (1995) 37 n. 45 interprets the example somewhat differently: you bite your lips "to conceal and control your feelings, as against expressing them further by gnashing your teeth, tearing your clothes, etc."

⁴¹ Arrighetti (1954) 113 argues that Hieronymus agrees with the Stoics that anger should be eliminated; but I think he misconstrues the context in Seneca. Biting one's lips was traditionally seen as a reflex of restraint at the onset of anger; cf. Plut. *Coh. ira* 458D, Hom. *Od.* 1.381 = 18.410 = 20.268, Eur. *Bacch.* 621.

⁴² *SVF* 3.395–8.

reserved ὀργή and *ira* for the latter and labelled the former θυμός or “temper” (Cicero uses *excandescencia* in *Tusc.* 4.21).⁴² Plutarch, adopting this usage here, speaks of “watching our *temper* at the start”; and he claims that we can often “quell our *temper* simply by staying silent and ignoring it.” That is essentially the tactic of delay he later ascribes to Hieronymus in 26. Yet here he promptly criticizes him for claiming that “we perceive anger not while it is beginning [γίνομένης] but only after it has begun [γεγεννημένης].” Plutarch’s objection aside, that suggests again that Hieronymus considered anger a natural reaction; more precisely, it suggests that he thought anger often originates independently of deliberate decision. Here again he is in line with Aristotle, who emphasizes repeatedly our emotional susceptibility to first impressions, and especially in cases of anger: like a dog that hears an intruder, θυμός and anger are easily incited.⁴³ His view implies neither that we cannot control our *actions* when angry, nor that *everyone*, including the virtuous, is easily angered. But it does challenge the Stoic analysis of anger as a judgment made by reason. Plutarch’s objection, in short, probably derives from Stoic critics of Hieronymus, as do reports about his account of the *telos*.

Hieronymus may not have been a very original thinker in ethics. I have argued that we find him repeatedly taking positions that correspond fairly closely to what we find in Aristotle’s work. But the evidence here reviewed shows him responding creatively to contemporary issues. He did not simply continue to parrot Aristotle’s pronouncements. Whether he could, in fact, is a matter of controversy: we cannot be sure that he had access to any of Aristotle’s writings, let alone the treatises we have today. Our evidence for Lyco suggests something similar. It may be no great loss in either case that we cannot read more of their writings. But one thing can be said with reasonable probability. Aristotelian ethics did not fall moribund under their influence. The party ultimately responsible for this impression is probably not Cicero, nor Antiochus from whom he adopted his verdict, but Chrysippus, whose powerful critique of Aristotelian ethics in the latter half of the third century was not forcefully met for several decades. There is no disgrace if the work of Lyco and Hieronymus succumbed to his attacks.

⁴³ NE 7.6 singles out for special discussion *akrasia* regarding θυμός, namely anger; see Cooper (1996) 258–64.

Neither was an Achilles, as Arcesilaus might have said (cf. D.L. 4.22), but both were worthy opponents for the Stoic Hector to Hector.

Works Cited

- Algra, K. A. 1997. "Chrysippus, Carneades, Cicero: The Ethical *Divisiones* in Cicero's *Lucullus*," in *Assent and Argument*, ed. B. Inwood and J. Mansfeld (Leiden: Brill), 107–39.
- Annas, J. 1993. *The Morality of Happiness* (Oxford: Oxford University).
- Arrighetti, G. 1954. "Ieronimo di Rodi," *Studi classici e orientali* 3: 111–28.
- Bett, R. 1989. "Carneades' *pithanon*: a Reappraisal of its Role and Status," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 7: 59–94.
- Brennan, T. 1996. "Reasonable Impressions in Stoicism," *Phronesis* 41: 318–34.
- . 1998. "The Old Stoic Theory of Emotions," in *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy*, ed. J. Sihvola and T. Engberg-Pedersen (Dordrecht: Kluwer), 21–70.
- Cooper, J. 1996. "Reason, Moral Virtue, and Moral Value," in Cooper, *Reason and Emotion* (Princeton: Princeton University), 253–80.
- Dalfino, M. C. 1993. "Ieronimo di Rodi: la dottrina della *vacuitas doloris*," *Elenchos* 14: 277–304.
- Donini, P. L. 1995. "Struttura delle passioni e del vizio e loro cura in Crisippo," *Elenchos* 16: 305–29.
- Gottschalk, H. B. 1987. "Aristotelian Philosophy in the Roman World from the Time of Cicero to the End of the Second Century A.D.," in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II, vol. 36.2 (Berlin: de Gruyter): 1079–174.
- Inwood, B. 1985. *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism* (Oxford: Oxford University).
- Morau, P. 1973. *Die Aristotelismus bei den Griechen*, vol. 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter).
- Pohlenz, M. 1896. "Über Plutarchs Schrift Περὶ ἀπορησίας," *Hermes* 31: 321–38.
- Procopé, J. 1995. *Seneca: Moral and Political Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University).

- Rabbow, P. 1914. *Antike Schriften über Seelenheilung und Seelenleitung auf ihre Quellen untersucht*, vol. 1: *Die Therapie des Zorns* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Repici, L. 1977. "Lo sviluppo delle dottrine etiche nel Peripato," in *Scuole socratiche minori e filosofia ellenistica*, ed. G. Giannantoni (Rome: Mulino), 215–43.
- Striker, G. 1993. "Epicurean Hedonism," in *Passions and Perceptions*, ed. J. Brunschwig and M.C. Nussbaum (Cambridge: Cambridge University), 3–17. Reprinted in Striker, *Essays on Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1996), 196–208.
- Wehrli, F. 1968². *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 6: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (Basel: Schwabe).
- . 1969². *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 10: *Hieronimos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler* (Basel: Schwabe).
- White, S. A. 1992. *Sovereign Virtue: Aristotle on the Relation Between Happiness and Prosperity* (Stanford: Stanford University).
- . 1995. "Cicero and the Therapists," in *Cicero the Philosopher*, ed. J. G. F. Powell (Oxford: Oxford University), 219–46.
- . 2002. "Happiness in the Hellenistic Lyceum," *Apeiron* Suppl. 35: 69–93.
- Wilamowitz Moellendorff, U. von. 1881. *Antigonos von Karystos* (Berlin: Weidmann).
- Zeller, E. 1879³. *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, vol. 2.2: *Aristoteles und die alten Peripatetiker* (Leipzig: Fues).

10

Lyco φραστικός Comments on Ten Texts

William W. Fortenbaugh

1: Text 11

In Book 5 of his dialogue *On the Ends of Goods*, Cicero has Piso discuss happiness from a Peripatetic point of view. Piso begins with some preliminaries: he divides Peripatetic philosophy into physics, logic and ethics (9–11), discusses apparent disagreement between exoteric and esoteric writings and real disagreement between Aristotle and Theophrastus (12), decides to make Aristotle and Theophrastus his authorities (12–13), and describes their followers as degenerate (13–14). After that Piso turns to his main theme: the highest good (14). What interests me is the discussion of degenerate Peripatetics, for there Piso mentions Lyco, describing him as *oratione locuples, rebus ipsis ieiuunior*, “rich in style and rather poor in the content itself” (5.13 = **11.6–7**). In regard to poverty of content, Piso’s judgment finds support in the fact that later authors hardly mention Lyco’s views, though we do have two interesting, albeit brief, reports concerning his views on consolation and happiness (**9** and **10**).¹ In regard to richness of style, Piso’s

¹ On text **9**, see White (1995) 235–6, and on text **10**, see White (2002) 70–5 and his article in this volume.

judgment is difficult to confirm in the absence of surviving works, but Diogenes Laertius not only calls him *φραστικός*, “eloquent” (1.3), but also presents five sayings of Lyco in order to illustrate his eloquence. These sayings do exhibit a certain richness of expression, and to that extent, they support not only Diogenes’ assessment of Lyco’s style but also the judgment which Cicero puts in the mouth of Piso.

There are, however, reasons for hesitation before embracing what we read in *On the Ends of Goods*. Here are three. First, Lyco may have written on scientific subjects, on minerals and animals in particular (13 and 15), and if he did, his writings on these subjects are likely to have been esoteric treatises or commentaries, which lacked a rich style.² In addition, he may have written on drama (14), and again his style is likely to have lacked richness. Perhaps these writings were also poor in content, but whether Cicero knew of them and had read them for himself is doubtful. Second, Lyco is treated quite superficially. He is mentioned in a list, after Strato and before Aristo, and the assessments of Lyco and Aristo are quite similar. The former is said to be rich in style and poor in content; the latter is said to be polished and elegant but lacking in gravity and authority (5.13). Nothing specific is said concerning either Lyco’s or Aristo’s view of the highest good. Perhaps Cicero thought their views unworthy of mention, but one wonders whether Cicero had any detailed knowledge of their views.³ Third, since Lyco is hardly distinguished from Aristo, we may wonder whether the assessment of Lyco’s style is of great value. To be sure, it finds support in what Diogenes says about Lyco, but we may still ask whether Cicero himself had read the writings of Lyco and Aristo. Perhaps on one or more occasions, he had their exoteric writings in his hands, but I am inclined to believe that he is reporting little more than a handbook evaluation.

² It has, however, been doubted that Lyco wrote on animals (Capelle [1927] 2306) and that his remarks on salt were part of a scientific investigation. See Sharples and Hellmann in Fortenbaugh and White (forthcoming).

³ We may contrast the remarks concerning Lyco and Aristo with the immediately following remark concerning Hieronymus. There we are given his definition of the highest good (5.14). A less striking contrast but still a contrast is provided by the immediately preceding remark concerning Strato. He is said to have devoted himself to physics and to have said very little about ethics (5.13). That is a meager report, but it is something and more than we get regarding Lyco and Aristo.

There is still a fourth reason for hesitation. All of the Greek texts which can be cited to confirm Cicero's judgment concerning Lyco's richness of style are brief sayings. Some may be authentic, word for word quotations of what Lyco actually said or wrote on a particular occasion, but that is difficult to prove. For sayings are subject to modification. A later writer or an anthologist may introduce changes in diction and composition; he may even add elements which he thinks will improve the saying, but which sometimes have the opposite effect. Furthermore, whole sayings may be attributed first to one person and then to another, so that either the original attribution is lost or we are left with multiple attribution.⁴ In subsequent sections, I shall consider the sayings of Lyco with these concerns in mind, first taking up the sayings recorded by Diogenes (1.1–26), second those found in various anthologies (16–21) and third an anecdotal remark recorded by Themistius (7). After that I shall consider a continuous text, Lyco's characterization of the drunkard (12). It would be invaluable evidence concerning Lyco's style were it preserved in Greek, but what we have is a Latin translation, which may well reflect Lyco's style, but to what extent is problematic. My conclusion will be appropriately cautious. While there is no good reason to reject the judgment of Cicero and Diogenes, the available evidence tells us more about the later tradition than about Lyco himself.

2: Text 1.1–26

Lyco lived from *circa* 300 to 225 BCE; Diogenes wrote his *Compendium of the Lives and Opinions of Philosophers* between 200 and 250 CE. There is, then, a gap of close to five hundred years between Lyco's headship of the Peripatos and Diogenes' work as a biographer. While chronological distance in itself is not sufficient to discredit what Diogenes tells us, it is grounds for caution, and in the case of sayings caution seems especially advisable. Nevertheless, the sayings of Lyco as recorded by Diogenes are exceptional in that they are built into the biography. They are introduced as examples within a discussion of

⁴ On such problems, see Searby (1998) 23–7, who points out that confusion concerning the attribution of a saying occurs early and can be documented for the third century BCE: "Theophrastus or Anaximenes," papyrus Pack² 1754 col. 3.25 = Theophrastus 487.1 FHS&G = L 47 Fortenbaugh (1984) with commentary on p. 212–13.

Lyco's elegance (5.65–6 = 1.2–26). That contrasts with the sayings found in the biographies of three other Peripatetic philosophers: Aristotle (5.17–21 = 11–36 Searby), Theophrastus (5.39–40 = 1.41–5 FHS&G) and Demetrius of Phalerum (5.82–3 = 1.111–26 SOD).⁵ In these cases, Diogenes lists the sayings in a bunch, so that they form a detachable segment. One has the impression that Diogenes has lifted them from an anthology or similar source, which may or may not be reliable in its attributions. With Lyco, however, the sayings are not detachable. It seems not only possible but even probable that Diogenes found them in a biographical source. That could have been an early "Life" of Lyco, perhaps one composed by Aristo, Lyco's pupil and likely successor as head of the Peripatos.⁶ That is, of course, speculation, but it is not wild speculation, and if it is correct, then the attributions will have a high degree of reliability,⁷ though stylistic changes may well have occurred. With that in mind, I turn to the sayings themselves.

After telling us that Lyco succeeded Strato as head of the Peripatos, Diogenes Laertius describes his subject as a φραστικός ἀνὴρ, an "eloquent man," and one who is extremely resolute in regard to the education of children (1.3–4). In support of this description, Diogenes cites a saying of Lyco concerning qualities desirable in young people: δεῖν παρεξεδῆχθαι τοῖς παισὶ τὴν αἰδῶ καὶ φιλοτιμίαν ὥς τοῖς ἵπποις μύωπα καὶ χαλινόν, "Shame and ambition must be joined by yoke to children, just as spur and bridle (are) to horses" (1.4–6). The content of this saying fits the claim that Lyco was keenly involved in education, and the words exhibit a goodly measure of eloquence. To be sure, the words are in indirect discourse, so that strictly speaking, they do not constitute a quotation,⁸ but the diction and even the composition are

⁵ In two of the Peripatetic "Lives," those of Strato and Heraclides, there are no sayings. See Sollenberger (1992) 3839–42.

⁶ See text 23.6–7 with Wehrli (1968) 21 and 65.

⁷ Even if Diogenes' source is a Hellenistic biography, we cannot be certain that each of the sayings is genuine. Temporal proximity is compatible with confusion concerning attribution (see above, n. 3). If the biographer were Aristo or someone else close to Lyco, that would give the attributions a high degree of reliability, but we still could not be certain that the biographer did not invent or transform a saying for his own purposes.

⁸ The use of indirect discourse is of little significance. Cf. the "Life of Theophrastus," in which Diogenes lists three sayings (5.39–40 = 1.41–5 FHS&G). The first and third occur in indirect discourse, the second in direct.

almost certainly true to the saying in its original form, i.e., in direct discourse. There is metaphor: “being joined by yoke” is transferred from animals to children. In addition, there is balanced composition; dative precedes accusative in both halves of the saying. Finally, there is chiasmus: “shame,” which comes first, corresponds to “the bridle,” which comes second, and “ambition,” which comes second, corresponds to the “spur,” which comes first. The reference to spur and bridle in the second half recalls what Aristotle is reported to have said concerning Callisthenes and Theophrastus: the former needs a spur and the latter a bridle (D.L. 5.39 = 1.33–8 FHS&G).⁹ Plato is said to have expressed himself in the same way with regard to Xenocrates and Aristotle (D.L. 4.6),¹⁰ and the same is said of Isocrates with reference to Ephorus and Theopompus (Cic. *Att.* 6.1.12).¹¹ As a result, the second half of the saying attributed to Lyco may appear hackneyed, and its authenticity as a saying of Lyco may be questioned,¹² but before rejecting the saying, we should take note of the fact that the image of spur and bridle is being used in an original way. The saying does not concern relatively mature students like Callisthenes and Theophrastus; rather, its focus is on children. In addition, spur and bridle are not divided between two particular people. Instead, they are kept together in order to elucidate a general truth concerning all (or almost all) children: just as a horse is fitted with both spur and bridle for use on different occasions, so a child needs both shame and ambition if his behavior is to be correct at all times. And much as the spur and bridle are brought to the horse and are not part of its nature, so shame and ambition are to be thought of as acquired qualities which should be conveyed during a child’s early education.¹³ If Diogenes is correct that Lyco was keenly

⁹ The word for spur is different, κέντρον in 5.39 = 1.38 FHS&G and μύωψ in 5.65 = 1.5, but that does not affect the identity of the idea.

¹⁰ Here at 4.6 the word for spur is μύωψ as in 5.65 = 1.5.

¹¹ For additional references, see the *apparatus* to 1.34–8 FHS&G.

¹² The authenticity of the saying as attributed to Aristotle has been questioned by Bosworth (1970) 410, who speaks of “a well-worn and worthless anecdote.” Sollenberger (1984) 197 is more sanguine concerning the attribution; he speaks of “a favorite metaphorical expression used by teachers of the fourth century BCE.” See also Seaby (1998) 191.

¹³ Acquired qualities may be contrasted with innate ones. Theophrastus is said to have needed a bridle because of excessive quickness, and Callisthenes a spur because of a natural sluggishness (D.L. 5.39 = 1.36–7 FHS&G). Both quickness = impetuosity and sluggishness = lethargy may be innate qualities, and the unfortunate consequences

interested in the education of children (1.3–4, cf. 7), the saying certainly suits him, and indeed may go back to him.

In what follows, Diogenes speaks of Lyco's eloquence and superiority in expression: τὸ δὲ ἐκφραστικὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ περιγεγονὸς ἐν τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ (1.6–7). The word ἐκφραστικὸν recalls the earlier occurrence of φραστικός (1.2), and the phrase περιγεγονὸς ἐν τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ reinforces the idea that Lyco was a man of eloquence. By way of illustration, Diogenes quotes a second saying of Lyco concerning a penniless maiden: βαρὺ γὰρ φορτίον πατρὶ κόρη διὰ σπάνιν προικὸς ἐκτρέχουσα τὸν ἀκμαῖον τῆς ἡλικίας καιρόν, "For a heavy burden to a father is a maiden when for lack of a dowry she outruns the peak time of her womanhood" (1.8–10). The metaphorical use of ἐκτρέχειν is certainly appealing and the phrase βαρὺ φορτίον is striking when applied to a family member, but such usage is hardly new. We may compare the comic poet Antiphanes (4th c. BCE), who wrote: οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν βαρύτερον τῶν φορτίων | ὄντως γυναικὸς προῖκα πολλὴν φερομένης, "There is no heavier burden in fact than a wife who brings a large dowry" (fr. 329 Kock).¹⁴ The idea expressed is in some respects the opposite of that put forward in the saying attributed to Lyco: wife is opposed to maiden, as is a large dowry to a meager one. It is tempting to think that Lyco was playing with the verse of Antiphanes or some other similar verse, but concerns with a suitable dowry and its effect on marriage were so widespread in ancient Greece, that Lyco—if the saying is truly his—will have needed no particular model.¹⁵ In any case, the final five words τὸν ἀκμαῖον τῆς ἡλικίας καιρόν, through their number, add weight to the notion of a proper age for marriage, but equally the number may seem excessive (cp. the use of καιρός without modifiers in 1.18).¹⁶

of these qualities can be avoided, at least to some extent, through the acquisition of learned attributes. A strong sense of shame may suppress impetuosity and ambition may counter lethargy. (On the character of Callisthenes, see Fortenbaugh [1984] 232–4.) In the case of a young person (not a mature student like Theophrastus and Callisthenes), it may be sensible to instill both shame and ambition, for a character which is immature and therefore still developing may be unstable. At one moment impetuosity is exhibited and at another sluggishness. In any case, the values which underlie a proper sense of shame and a proper ambition are desirable, so that they should be taught to young people regardless of which way their innate temperament inclines.

¹⁴ The same two verses are also attributed to Alexis, 4–3 c. BCE (fr. 341 Kock).

¹⁵ Cp. Theophrastus, *On Marriage*: "A poor wife is difficult to support; a rich one is a torment to endure" (486.23 FHS&G = L 46.22 Fortenbaugh [1984]).

It is a matter of some interest that Casaubon emended περιγεγώνος (1.6) to read περιγεγωνός.¹⁷ The latter word is not attested elsewhere; it is a construction of Casaubon, based on the perfect participle γεγωνός meaning “loud sounding” or “sonorous.”¹⁸ Subsequent editors have followed Casaubon and printed περιγεγωνός. Stork in the present edition is an exception, and in my judgment, he is correct to resist an emendation for which there is little philological support. That does not mean, however, that the emendation is foolish and that those who have accepted it were blinded by the brilliance of Casaubon. For after τὸ ἐκφραστικόν, the words καὶ περιγεγωνός ἐν τῇ ἑρμηνείᾳ add little except emphasis, and more importantly, what follows (1.10–17) introduces delivery and therefore voice, which in the case of Lyco may have been marked by an extraordinarily sonorous quality, τὸ περιγεγωνός.

Diogenes cites Antigonus,¹⁹ who compared Lyco’s manner of expression to the smell and charm of an apple: οὐκ ἦν ὥσπερ μήλου τὴν εὐωδίαν καὶ χάριν ἄλλοθί που μετενεγκεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθάπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ δένδρου τῶν λεγομένων ἕκαστον ἔδει θεωρεῖσθαι, “It was not possible to transfer as it were the good smell and charm of an apple to any other place, but each of his (Lyco’s) utterances had to be observed ‘on’ the man himself just as (the qualities of the apple must be observed) on the tree” (1.11–14). The use of “charm,” χάρις, in regard to an apple establishes a connection with Lyco’s manner of expression, for “charm” is also a standard word in discussions of style.²⁰ What may cause concern is the claim that the

¹⁶ I am not suggesting that the combination of words — ἀκμαῖος modifying καιρός together with a genitive of specification — is without parallel (cf. Polybius 3.102.1: τὸν ἀκμαϊότατον καιρὸν τῆς ἡμέρας, cited by LSJ s.v. ἀκμαῖος 1); only that the fullness of expression may appear unnecessary and therefore detract from the idea being expressed.

¹⁷ Casaubon (1616) 78: *Repone me auctore elegantem vocem περιγεγωνός. Sic vocat styllum elatum, ac, ut sic dicam, nimis vocalem.*

¹⁸ See LSJ s.v. γέγωνα 1 and 3 *ad fin.* and γεγωνός 2.

¹⁹ This Antigonus (1.10) appears to be Antigonus Gonatas, who was the son of Demetrius Poliorcetes and heir of the Antigonid dynasty in Macedonia. See Wehrli (1968) 24 and Dorandi (1999) lxvi. Wilamowitz (1881) 79 suggests that Diogenes is confused: he is thinking of Antigonas Gonatas, when in fact the comparison was made by the biographer Antigonus of Carystus, who is cited as a source for Lyco later in Diogenes’ “Life” (1.32–3) and also in Athenaeus (8.12). Cf. Capelle (1927) 2303–5. At 1.10 Diogenes does not cite Antigonus directly, but rather refers to what people say. Such an indirect reference suits Antigonus Gonatas.

pleasing qualities of an apple must be observed when the apple is on the tree. That seems false, but in context it serves to make a point: namely, that Lyco's charm was best appreciated "on" him, i.e., when he spoke, for his charm depended on or at least was significantly enhanced by his delivery.²¹ That is not contradicted by what follows. Diogenes explains²² that Lyco was most sweet when he spoke, ἐν τῷ λέγειν γλυκύτερος (1.14–15), and for that reason some people wanted to add a gamma at the beginning of his name (1.14–16).²³ Sweetness is a traditional attribute of pleasing delivery,²⁴ and it seems to be so here, for Diogenes goes on to note that in writing Lyco was not equal to himself. In short, his written prose, when simply read, failed to exhibit the sweetness of which he was capable in live delivery (1.16–17).²⁵

If the remarks of the preceding paragraph are not misguided, we can interpret Casaubon's emendation in an interesting way. Diogenes (or his source) wrote περιγεγωνός ἐν τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ, "sonorousness in the expression (of his thoughts)," because he wanted to call attention to the fact that Lyco not only composed eloquent prose (his style was admirable) but also composed prose which supported a sonorous delivery. When Lyco spoke aloud he was impressive, but when his words were read apart from delivery, their impact was diminished, so that Lyco appeared to be "not equal to himself." Such an interpretation presupposes an important truth—style and delivery can work and most often should work together²⁶—and for that reason it may be tempting to accept the interpretation and with it Casaubon's emendation. Nevertheless, I think that we should resist the temptation. My reason for saying so is not that Lyco will have ignored the connection between style and delivery. On the contrary, later when discussing text **12**, I shall call attention to two places where Lyco seems to be using style with a view to delivery. Rather, my reason for resisting emendation is that the ex-

²⁰ For some discussion of charm, see below, Section 4.

²¹ Wehrli (1968) 24–5.

²² τοῦτο δὲ ὅτι, "this was said because" (1.14).

²³ His name would become Γλύκων, "Sweet One." Cf. Aristoph. *Eccl.* 985.

²⁴ Sweetness is applied to delivery at the very beginning of Greek literature. In *Iliad* 1.248–9, Homer describes Nestor as pleasing, a clear-voiced speaker, whose voice is sweeter than honey.

²⁵ Lines 14–17 are to be read as a unit: δέ in line 16 answers μέν in line 14.

²⁶ Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 3.1 1404a16 and 3.12 1413b8–31 with remarks in Fortenbaugh (1986) 251–2.

ample which follows the disputed phrase (1.7–10) seems to be concerned with style and not with delivery. The discussion of delivery begins three lines later (1.10) and Diogenes may be making quite a simple point. Lyco had an attractive delivery which was able to elevate his prose. He was not unlike a skilled actor whose delivery is often more important than the playwright's text (cp. Arist. *Rhet.* 3.1 1403b33–4). If there is an objection here, it concerns the word διό, “wherefore” (1.10). A connection is indicated with what precedes and that seems to tell against recognizing a clean break: first style and then delivery. Nevertheless, I am inclined to think that the occurrence of διό should not be pressed. Diogenes may well have introduced it to give the impression of continuity. He is “cutting and pasting” and adds transitional words, sometimes thoughtfully,²⁷ sometimes less so.²⁸

After the remarks on delivery, Diogenes returns to Lyco's style and offers three examples, all in indirect discourse. The first concerns persons who regret not having acquired learning at the opportune time and pray that they might still do so. Lyco is said to have turned an elegant phrase, ἐκαλλιλέκτει (1.18–19), saying: αὐτῶν κατηγορεῖν ἀδυνάτω μὴνύοντας εὐχῇ μετάνοιαν ἀργίας ἀδιόρθωτον, “they denounce themselves by betraying in impotent prayer an irremediable regret about their laziness” (1.19–20). The idea that the people in question denounce themselves catches the attention, and the separation of adjective and noun, repeated and with the order reversed, does exhibit a measure of elegance. The saying suits someone who is interested in education, though it may be more apt in regard to mature students within the Peripatos than to younger persons, παῖδες, who are said to have been Lyco's special concern (1.3–4).

The next example concerns men who do not deliberate correctly: τοὺς βουλευομένους (οὐκ) ὀρθῶς διαπίπτειν τῷ λογισμῷ, οἷον εἰ στρεβλῷ κανόνι βασανίζοντες εὐθείαν φύσιν ἢ πρόσωπον ὕδατι κλυδαττομένῳ ἢ κατόπτρῳ διεστραμμένῳ, “Those who deliberate incorrectly fall to pieces through their reasoning, as if they were examining a straight substance with a crooked (carpenter's) rule, or a face in

²⁷ The use of ἀμέλει γοῦν (1.17) is successful; it marks the return to style after the remarks on delivery.

²⁸ If I am correct, the lines concerned with delivery interrupt Diogenes' survey of elegant sayings and can be interpreted broadly, so that they apply to academic situations (Lyco's lectures), political deliberations (1.26–7), and all kinds of social interaction.

rough water or in a distorted mirror” (1.21–4). The idea of falling through or falling to pieces, διαπίπτειν, is an attractive metaphor when applied to reasoning,²⁹ and the same may be said of the crooked rule. But the image of the crooked rule is hardly new. It occurs in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, where we are told that “it is not right to distort (the mind of) the judge by leading him into anger or envy or pity, for it would be as if someone made crooked the rule he was about to use” (1.1 1354a26).³⁰ What may disturb, however, is the addition of “or a face in rough water or in a distorted mirror.” It is not that the images of rough water and a distorted mirror are unintelligible; they are no more far fetched than likening faulty deliberation to the use of a crooked rule when testing the straightness of a surface. Rather, the images seem unnecessary after the comparison with a crooked rule, and the repetition of “or” only emphasizes the piling up of comparisons at the end of the saying. Perhaps the bipartite addition does not belong to the original saying; it may have been added by someone who thought that he was enhancing the saying, while doing the reverse. Or the saying may condense a longer passage in which Lyco made separate use of all three images.³¹ Be that as it may, the saying may be related to Lyco’s own life. Diogenes tells us that he advised the Athenians often and with great benefit (1.26–7). On some occasion Lyco may have referred to failed deliberations, using one or

²⁹ I have translated the verb διαπίπτειν with “to fall to pieces,” for the metaphor works in English. Of course, we do say that someone or something “falls through the cracks,” but that is more a matter of passing unnoticed than of failing to reason correctly. In German, however, a literal translation seems possible, for *durchfallen* is used metaphorically for failing an exam or the like.

³⁰ Cf. Arist. *NE* 3.4 1113a33, where we are told that the morally good man sees the truth in each case, since he is, as it were, a rule and measure (ὥσπερ κανὼν καὶ μέτρον), and Theophrastus, *ap. Stob.* 2.7.20 (2.141.10 Wachsmuth = 449A.19 FHS&G), where we read that the temperate man uses reason like a rule (καθάπερ κανόνι) to make determinations in accordance with propriety. The crooked rule mentioned in the saying is not to be confused with the pliable rule which was used on Lesbos in order to reproduce the shape of a particular stone. The rule was made of lead and therefore able to take the shape of a stone which is not straight. See *NE* 5.10 1137b29–32, where the Stagirite refers to this kind of rule, in order to elucidate the fact that a decree is adapted to a given situation.

³¹ The second possibility has been suggested to me by Denis Searby in private correspondence. The possibility is of some interest, for it makes clear how a biographer or other author can create a saying by bringing together material which he found separated in an extended text.

more striking images, in order to create a favorable contrast with his own success. But that is speculation.

The last example concerns the crown or wreath awarded at Athens for public service³² and the wreath awarded at Olympia for victory in sport: ἐπὶ μὲν τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς στέφανον πολλοὺς ἀπιέναι, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν Ὀλυμπίασιν ἢ ὀλίγους ἢ οὐδέν, “many go in pursuit of the wreath to be won at the town center, but few or none (go) in pursuit of the (wreath to be won) at Olympia” (1.24–6). Here we have balanced construction: in both halves of the saying a prepositional phrase beginning with ἐπὶ comes first, followed by the subject. Furthermore, there is antithesis: many competitors are opposed to few or none. The addition of “none” is overstatement, and that may be thought to mar the contrast. Alternatively, the position of “none,” being the last word of the saying, might be thought to enhance the contrast. I am sympathetic to the former view,³³ but also want to suggest that the combination, “few” plus “none,” is so common that it may pass unnoticed, neither enhancing nor diminishing the elegance of the example.³⁴ Be that as it may, the saying can be related to Lyco’s own life. When we read about the few persons who pursue a wreath at Olympia (1.25–6), we may be reminded of the fact that Lyco was an athlete who competed in wrestling and ball at the Games of Ilium (1.33–4).³⁵ We can even imagine him

³² See, e.g., Hansen (1991) 145, who cites Aeschines, *Against Ctesiphon* 49–50, and writes, “The Athenians stimulated the political keenness of the citizenry every year by awarding honorary decrees and golden crowns to the man who ‘always by his speeches and proposals does what is best for the people.’”

³³ Dropping “none” would create not only a crisp but also a correct antithesis between many and few competitors. In addition, dropping “none” would entail dropping “either . . . or.” That would produce a shorter ending—ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν Ὀλυμπίασιν ὀλίγους—which would gain in impact by eliminating wordiness. It would also give greater prominence to repetition of sound: an initial omicron followed by lambda in the final two words, as called to my attention by David Mirhady.

³⁴ Adding “none” after “few” is so common that it hardly needs documentation. Nevertheless, I cite Plato’s *Apology*, which I have recently been reading. Here within one Stephanus page, we find the following: ὀλίγου τινὸς ἄξία ἐστὶ καὶ οὐδενός (23A7) and εἰδότην δὲ ὀλίγα ἢ οὐδέν (23C8).

³⁵ The fact that Lyco had cauliflower ears prompted Wilamowitz (1881) 82 and Capelle (1927) 2305 to view Lyco as a pankratiast, i.e., someone who competed in the pankration, a sport that mixed wrestling and boxing as well as kicking and strangling. But no ancient source explicitly connects Lyco with the pankration. What we are told is that he wrestled (1.33), and wrestling is a well known cause of cauliflower ears. That is why modern wrestlers wear a headgear with cups that cover the ears.

proudly identifying himself with those few persons who take sport seriously enough to compete in inter-city games. But again we are speculating. There is nothing in Diogenes "Life" which makes the identification explicit, and certainly nothing to suggest that Lyco himself competed at Olympia.

Although I have indicated some possible criticisms of the five sayings which Diogenes attributes to Lyco (two prior to the remark of Antigonus and three following), all exhibit recognizable features of style, and therefore all are in line with Diogenes' description of Lyco as a *φραστικὸς ἀνὴρ* (1.3).³⁶ In addition, four of the five sayings can be related to what we know of Lyco's life.³⁷ When these considerations are combined with the real possibility that Diogenes has taken the sayings from a Hellenistic biography, then there is good reason to accept the sayings as genuine and to say that they support Diogenes' description of Lyco. Nevertheless, we cannot be certain. It remains possible, however unlikely, that none of the sayings originated with Lyco, and that at least four of them were attributed to Lyco because they fit what was known about his life.³⁸

³⁶ I have written "in line with Diogenes' description of Lyco as a *φραστικὸς ἀνὴρ*," because stylistic features like balanced composition, antithesis and metaphor cannot prove the authorship of Lyco. Rather they agree with—are "in line with"—the tradition that Lyco was a writer of considerable elegance. Moreover, the stylistic features exhibited by the sayings attributed to Lyco are typical of sayings in general. They belong to the genre and therefore are not entirely reliable indicators of Lyco's personal style, i.e., those peculiarities which set him apart and earned him the label *φραστικός*. This observation applies equally and perhaps more so to the sayings which are attributed to Lyco in anthologies and discussed in the next section of this paper.

³⁷ The saying which cannot be related to Lyco's life (of which we know little) is that which concerns a penniless maiden (1.8–10).

³⁸ All the sayings are formulated in general terms, so that they invite repeated usage and can be attributed to many different people. We can, of course, imagine a specific context in which the sayings were uttered. For example, we can imagine that the words "she outruns the peak time of her maidenhood" (1.9–10) were spoken to a particular person with reference to a particular maiden. And the words "they denounce themselves" (1.19) may have been directed against particular persons, perhaps pupils of Lyco, who procrastinated in their studies. But as recorded by Diogenes, the thoughts are expressed in general terms and therefore can be transferred easily from one person to another.

3: Texts 16–21

Given Lyco's reputation as a φραστικός ἄνθρωπος (1.3), as *oratione locuples* (11.6), and given the sayings which Diogenes attributes to him, it is not surprising that Lyco's name is attached to sayings in later anthologies. I know of six, of which one is certainly spurious. It is found in the *Commonplaces* of pseudo-Maximus³⁹ and runs as follows: Γλύκωνος · γνώσις θεοῦ διὰ μακροθυμίας καὶ πραότητος εἰς ἄνδρα γνωρίζεται, "Glyco: 'Knowledge of god, through patience and gentleness toward man, is made known'" (21). The problem is not the attribution to Glyco. As Diogenes tells us, Lyco acquired the name Glyco because he was surpassingly sweet in speaking (1.14–16). Nor is it an absence of eloquence. The saying is consciously formulated so that it begins and ends with cognate words.⁴⁰ Rather the content speaks strongly against the attribution to Lyco, for it is patently Christian. How the saying came to be attributed to Glyco seems clear enough. In the collection entitled Ἀριστον καὶ πρῶτον μάθημα (APM), it occurs without attribution among sayings beginning with gamma.⁴¹ On the basis of this first letter, the saying was subsequently inserted into the *Apophthegmata Parisina* (*Corpus Parisinum*) immediately after two sayings attributed to Glyco. Later the compiler of the *Commonplaces* used the *Apophthegmata Parisina* as a source and wrongly assumed that saying 21, like the preceding two sayings, belongs to Glyco.⁴²

Of the other five sayings, three almost certainly—I would say certainly—did not originate with Lyco the Peripatetic. Like the saying just discussed, one is found in the *Commonplaces* of pseudo-Maximus, where it is attributed to Glyco.⁴³ It occurs in the chapter Περί

³⁹ Although the *Commonplaces* are often referred to Maximus the Confessor (580–662 CE), the collection is not his. See Gutas (1975) 25–8, Searby (1998) 59–61, and Ihm (2001) 1.

⁴⁰ If I understand this use of γνώσις and γνωρίζεται correctly, the saying is telling us that a person's knowledge of god is demonstrated (made or becomes known; LSJ I.1) to others through that person's patience and gentleness in dealing with his fellow man.

⁴¹ The saying is no. 26 in Schenkl (1889).

⁴² The explanation is that of Schenkl (1888) 508 n. 2. See the *apparatus* to text 21 and the note to the translation.

⁴³ Caveat: In the short version of pseudo-Maximus' *Commonplaces* as edited by Combefis (1675) and printed in PG 91.941.21, the attribution is to Lyco as against Glyco.

γλωσσαλγίας, “On Loquacity” (47) and runs as follows: Γλύκωνος· καθάπερ αἱ χελιδόνες τῷ συνεχεῖ τῆς λαλιᾶς τὴν ἡδονὴν τῆς ὁμιλίας ἀποβάλλουσιν, οὕτως οἱ ἀδολέσχει ὀχλήσεις συνεχεῖς ποιούμενοι ἀηδεῖς ἀποφαίνονται τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις, “Glyco: ‘Just as swallows by continuous chatter ruin the pleasure of company, so babblers who create continuous annoyance prove unpleasant to those who listen’” (20). The comparison of babblers with swallows is attention getting, and there is a certain balance in the way the thought is presented: there are two halves, and in each the order is subject, cause, and effect. But the statement of cause and effect takes different grammatical forms, and the entire saying is long, so that it loses impact. Quite different is a related saying which is attributed to Pythagoras in Porphyry’s *Life of Pythagoras* (1.42): μηδὲ χελιδόνες ἐν οἰκίᾳ δέχεσθαι, “Don’t let swallows in the house” (p. 39.18–19 Nauck). Here the saying is so brief that it has become enigmatic. Following Aristotle (p. 38.21), Porphyry explains it as follows: τοῦτ’ ἔστι λάλους ἀνθρώπους καὶ περὶ γλῶτταν ἀκρατεῖς ὁμωροφίους μὴ ποιεῖσθαι, “i.e., don’t share a roof with men who are chatterers and incontinent regarding the tongue” (p. 39.19–20).⁴⁴ The attribution to Pythagoras, if accepted, and the introduction of an Aristotelian explanation make clear that comparing babblers with swallows did not begin with Glyco, i.e., Lyco. Indeed, the comparison with swallows was a commonplace. We may compare Theophrastus’ sketch of the chatterer, ὁ λάλος, who says that he cannot keep quiet, even if he seems to be more of a chatterer than the swallows (*Characters* 7.7 St.). Perhaps, then, Lyco himself, drawing on tradition, formulated his own saying in which babblers are compared with swallows and said to ruin the pleasure of association. Or perhaps he reported someone else’s saying and commented on it in some lost work.⁴⁵ But having said that, I do not want to forget that we know of several persons called Lyco (1.52–4), and that at least one was

⁴⁴ Aristotle, fr. 191–2 Bekker = 196–7 Rose = 159 Gigon, and cf. Hieronymus, *Against Rufinus* 3.39 (PL 23 485B–486A) = Aristotle fr. 192 Bekker = 197 Rose = 160 Gigon. Aristotle’s interest in explaining obscure sayings is clear from *Rhet.* 2.22, where he discusses maxims which need supplementation (1394b7–1395a2).

⁴⁵ Commenting on the saying might explain the formal balance and the length of the version attributed to Lyco. In any case, we can say that the saying suits Lyco not only as a Peripatetic, but also as someone who enjoyed social interaction and was able to deal successfully with others both in Athens (1.26–7) and abroad (1.34–7, 7).

a Pythagorean who lived during the fourth century BCE.⁴⁶ It is easy to imagine him taking a cue from Pythagoras and formulating the comparison under consideration. Nevertheless, the connection with Lyco, whether the Peripatetic or the Pythagorean, may be—and in all probability is—a late development. Like saying **21**, so saying **20** is found without attribution in the collection entitled "Ἀριστον καὶ πρῶτον μάθημα. In accordance with the first word, καθάπερ, it occurs among sayings beginning with kappa.⁴⁷ When the saying was incorporated into the *Apophthegmata Parisina*, it was placed after sayings attributed to Κικέρων, Cicero, written in Greek with a kappa, but it remained un-attributed.⁴⁸ Later the compiler of the *Commonplaces* of pseudo-Maximus recorded the saying within the chapter "On Loquacity." It was placed after two sayings, of which the first concerns the danger inherent in garrulity and the second compares rhetors with frogs. In the *Apophthegmata Parisina*, the second is attributed to Glyco (**19**).⁴⁹ Apparently the compiler of the *Commonplaces* wrongly assumed that the saying concerning swallows also belonged to Glyco and recorded it as such.⁵⁰

The second saying, which is unlikely to have originated with Lyco, has just been mentioned. It concerns rhetors and frogs and can be found in several anthologies including the *Apophthegmata Parisina*: ὁ αὐτὸς τοὺς ῥήτορας ἔφη ὁμοίους εἶναι τοῖς βατράχοις· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἐν ὕδατι κελαδεῖν, τοὺς δὲ πρὸς κλεψύδραν, "The same man (Glyco)⁵¹ said that rhetors are like frogs, for the latter make a lot of noise in water and the former with reference to the water-clock" (**19**). Here the

⁴⁶ See Diels-Kranz 57 Lykon. Entry no. 1 includes D.L. 5.69 = 1.52–3. Since the Pythagorean Lyco is said to be from both Tarentum and Iasus (entries 1 and 3 in D-K), it may be that there are two Pythagoreans who shared the name Lyco. But that is no more than a possibility; Riedweg suggests that there may have been only one.

⁴⁷ The saying is no. 74 in Schenkl (1889).

⁴⁸ See Schenkl (1888) 485–6.

⁴⁹ The attribution to Glyco is almost certainly a mistake. See the discussion of saying **19**, which begins with the next paragraph.

⁵⁰ The explanation I am offering was suggested to me by Denis Searby in private correspondence. It should be noted that in most of the manuscripts containing the fuller version of the *Commonplaces*, the saying concerning rhetors and frogs drops out, so that the saying concerning the dangers of garrulity (attributed to Apollonius) immediately precedes the saying attributed to Glyco concerning swallows.

⁵¹ In the *Apophthegmata Parisina*, the preceding saying (**16**) is attributed to Glyco the wise (f. 148^v 2).

rhetors are persons speaking in court. They are compared with frogs, after which the comparison is explained. At first reading, the explanation may seem an unnecessary addition to what is a concise and stinging comparison. But even if the comparison is intelligible without being explained, the explanation is not without charm. When it is viewed in relation to the preceding comparison, there is chiasmus: first, rhetors followed by frogs; second, frogs before rhetors. Further, the explanation is composed of two balanced clauses, of which the second lacks a verb. That makes for brevity; more importantly, one readily supplies *κελαδεῖν* and thinks of rhetors making unintelligible sounds like the croaking of frogs. In addition, the final word, “water-clock,” comes as a surprise. We might expect to hear that the rhetors are speaking in court, but instead they are said to speak with reference to or against the water-clock. The “water” in “water-clock” is a play on the previous reference to water, and more importantly, the mention of the water-clock suggests constraint: whereas frogs croak happily at their own pace, rhetors are forced to race against the clock—a constraint which may produce incoherent speech.

It seems, then, that the saying taken as a whole, i.e., including the explanation, has a charm which suits an author known for his elegance. But that does not mean that the saying originated with Lyco. Indeed, it is also attributed to Apollonius, Aesop and Gorgias. The attribution to Apollonius is found only in Combefis’ edition of pseudo-Maximus, where in all likelihood, the attribution is an error made by the editor Combefis. The attribution to Aesop occurs in several manuscripts⁵² and fits well with the mention of animals, i.e., frogs. But the attribution is challenged in the manuscripts: *Γλύκωνος*, “of Glyco,” has been written in above *ὁ αὐτός*, “the same” = Aesop.⁵³ In the case of Gorgias, we can say that the attribution is found in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* and in the derivative *Florilegium Monacense* and *Florilegium Leidense*. The focus on the rhetor makes one think of Gorgias, who taught persuasive speech,⁵⁴ and the attribution to Gorgias suggests one way—the

⁵² In his *apparatus* to *sententia* 22a, Perry (1952) 253 lists seven manuscripts.

⁵³ See the *apparatus* of Perry to *sententia* 22a, where Perry says that the addition of *Γλύκωνος* occurs in all seven manuscripts.

⁵⁴ The fact that the saying is not complimentary to rhetors does not count against the attribution to Gorgias. In the saying, the rhetors are not teachers of rhetoric but speakers in court. Why shouldn’t Gorgias make fun of what he observed in the courts at Athens and elsewhere?

simplest and most likely way—in which the saying may have come to be connected with the name “Glyco.” An anthologist listed the sayings of Gorgias after those of Glyco; he failed to write out the name of Gorgias, and as a result, sayings of Gorgias were seen as belonging to Glyco.⁵⁵ In this way, the saying in question became associated with Lyco’s name not only in the *Apophthegmata Parisina* but also in derivative anthologies.⁵⁶

In the *Florilegium Monacense* and in the *Florilegium Leidense*,⁵⁷ the saying is not only attributed to Gorgias but also marked by variation. At the end comes ἐν τῇ γῇ, “on the land,” instead of “with reference to the water-clock.” That strengthens the balance exhibited in the two halves of the explanation: land contrasts perfectly with water. But the surprise is lost and with it much of the charm. Nevertheless “on the land” might be thought preferable, for without the concluding mention of the water-clock, the saying can be referred to orators in the assembly. The saying begins with the word ῥήτωρ, plural ῥήτορες (*re vera* τοὺς ῥήτορας), which is often used as a technical term with specific reference to persons who speak in the assembly and propose motions for the approval of that body.⁵⁸ If that is the usage at the beginning of the saying, then introducing the water-clock at the end of the saying is inappropriate, for the length of speeches in the assembly was not limited by such a device. But is ῥήτορες at the beginning of the sentence used as a technical term to refer to speakers in the assembly? I think not, for ῥήτορες can be used in an inclusive sense which covers both speakers in the assembly and those in court,⁵⁹ and this usage seems especially appropriate if the saying was originally attributed to Gorgias. For in the dialogue named after the great sophist, Plato has Gorgias agree with Socrates that the business of the ῥήτωρ is to be persuasive in courts of law and other public meetings (455A2–7). I conclude, then, that the reading ἐν τῇ γῇ need not be preferred (it is a change for the worse) and that the saying should be assigned to Gorgias.

The third saying, which is unlikely to have originated with Lyco, occurs in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* no. 165. It runs: ὁ αὐτὸς

⁵⁵ Schenkl (1888) 482 adds the missing name.

⁵⁶ See the *apparatus* to text 19.

⁵⁷ In the *Florilegium Monacense*, the saying is no. 173 (280.14–16 Meineke).

⁵⁸ See LSJ s.v. ῥήτωρ: “esp. at Athens, οἱ ῥήτορες the public speakers in the ἐκκλησία,” and Hansen (1991) 143–4.

⁵⁹ See, e.g., Arist. *Rhet.* 3.12 1414a15.

ἐρωτηθεὶς τί λυπεῖ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς εἶπε· “πονηρὸς εὐτυχῶν,” “The same man (Lyco),⁶⁰ when asked what causes pain to good people, said, ‘A wicked man enjoying good fortune’” (17). Here Lyco is presented as answering a question. That is a common formula in collections of sayings and may or may not be true to the context in which the saying first occurred.⁶¹ In any case, the response is admirably succinct. It is also concrete in comparison with a similar response attributed to Socrates in several anthologies. Replying to the same question, Socrates said: εὐτυχία πονηρῶν, “the good fortune of wicked men.” Here we have the abstract noun εὐτυχία followed by a generalizing plural. In contrast, Lyco speaks of a person in the singular. To be sure, the singular is to be understood as applying to all cases, but the use of the singular participle, εὐτυχῶν, coming last and modifying πονηρὸς, gives the response a more concrete feel and therefore an immediacy which is not present in Socrates’ reply.⁶²

⁶⁰ In the manuscript containing the *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, codex Vaticanus Graecus 743, saying no. 165 = 17 follows one attributed to Lyco, no. 164 = 16. However, the two sayings occur after sayings attributed to Bion and before sayings attributed to Gorgias. For that reason, Sternbach, the editor of the *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, has emended the attribution of 164 to read Glyco, so that both 164 and 165 are assigned to Glyco. For our purposes the emendation is of little consequence, for on either reading, the saying is attributed to Lyco the Peripatetic. See 1.14–16 and above on text 21.

⁶¹ The saying in its original form may have been a response to someone else’s question, but we can imagine other possibilities. For example, it may have been put forward in a treatise and been preceded by the author’s own reflections, none of which had the grammatical form of a question.

⁶² Since a wicked person may be hated, it is tempting to say that the response of good men to a wicked person enjoying good fortune is hate. But for Aristotle, at least, hate is not accompanied by pain (*Rhet.* 2.4 1382a12–13), which is explicitly mentioned in 17. Pain does accompany anger, but anger is caused by personal insult (2.2 1378a32–3), and there is nothing in the text to suggest that personal insult has occurred. In discussing tragedy, Aristotle is critical of plots in which vicious men pass from bad fortune to good fortune, εἰς εὐτυχίαν. He explains that such a plot appeals neither to the human feeling in us nor to our pity and fears (*Po.* 13 1452b36–1453a1). There is here a clear connection with text 17, but the information conveyed is largely negative. We are left wondering what label Aristotle and Peripatetics after him would use to name the painful emotion felt by good men when they perceive that a wicked man is enjoying good fortune. The answer may be indignation, for Aristotle connects feeling indignation (νεμεσᾶν) not only with good character but also with feeling pain (λυπεῖσθαι *Rhet.* 2.9 1386b9–14). However, he does not say that indignation is excited only by the good fortune of wicked men. Rather he characterizes indignation as a response to unmerited good fortune (1386b12) and hence as an emotion which can

In Combefis' edition of the *Commonplaces* of pseudo-Maximus (PG 91.833.7–8), the response of Socrates is followed by an explanation: φιλεῖ γὰρ εὐημερία παράλογος ὕβρεως ἔργα προκαλεῖσθαι, “for unexpected prosperity is apt to call forth acts of insolence.” The explanation is sensible, but equally the connection between the pain of good men and the good fortune of a wicked person is so obvious, that an explanation is not needed, and if given, it diminishes the attractiveness of the saying. We may cite Aristotle's distinction between maxims which need explanation and those which do not. The latter class includes those which are neither paradoxical nor disputable (*Rhet.* 2.21 1394b7–16), and that characterizes the response attributed to Socrates. Be that as it may, the addition is almost certainly the product of joining two originally separate sayings. For in all other sources, the addition is attributed to Charikleia.⁶³

The preceding observations show that the version of the saying attributed to Lyco—concrete and free of any unnecessary explanation—suits his reputation as a stylist, but it does not prove that the attribution to Socrates is wrong. Indeed, it seems quite probable that the saying goes back to Socrates, or at least was first attributed to him. Perhaps Lyco came across the saying in a Hellenistic anthology and used it in some writing of his own. Indeed, Lyco himself may have acknowledged his debt, explicitly attributing the saying to Socrates. Later a collector of sayings may have overlooked or ignored the attribution and cited Lyco alone.⁶⁴ Be that as it may, no anthology connects the more concrete, and in my judgment the more effective, response—πονηρὸς εὐτυχῶν instead of εὐτυχία πονηρῶν—with Socrates. It is Lyco's alone.

be directed at men who are undeserving but not necessarily wicked. They may even be good (1387a31).

⁶³ See the apparatus criticus to text 17.

⁶⁴ We may compare the collection known as the *Chreiae of Aristotle*. It contained sayings attributed to persons other than Aristotle. In some cases the original attribution was lost and the saying became attached to Aristotle. See Searby (1998) 77–84. Caveat: I am not asserting that Lyco himself collected the sayings of other people in an anthology, though he may have (cf. 22, where Photius tells us that Lyco was a source for Stobaeus). It would be sufficient that Lyco cited the sayings of others in his writings, most likely in works on ethics. But I am speculating.

A different saying is found in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* no. 403.⁶⁵ It runs as follows: Λύκων ἰδὼν γυναῖκα θρασεῖαν τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν πράττειν ἐθέλουσιν “οὔτε γυναῖκα” εἶπεν “ὁμοίαν ἀνδρὶ ἀποδέχομαι, οὔτε ἄνδρα ὅμοιον γυναικί,” “Having seen an overly bold woman who wished to do what men do, Lyco said, ‘I approve neither of a woman who is like a man nor of a man who is like a woman’” (18). The saying is marked by balance: there are two parts, each beginning with οὔτε and each exhibiting the same grammatical construction. There is also chiasmus, in that “woman” and “man” reverse positions in the two parts. The verb ἀποδέχομαι is not repeated; instead it comes at the end of the first part and is easily understood with the second part. In sum, the saying has a formal appearance, which is not unattractive. That harmonizes with Lyco’s reputation for elegance. The theme, however, does not connect closely with what we know of Lyco’s interests, unless it be with education. To my knowledge, the saying is not attributed to anyone else, nor to Lyco elsewhere than in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum*. Perhaps the saying did originate with Lyco, but we have little evidence to support the possibility.⁶⁶

A final (sixth) saying associated with the name “Lyco” is found in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* no. 164. It runs: Λύκων ὁ φιλόσοφος τὴν παιδείαν ἔλεγεν ἱερὸν ἄσυλον εἶναι, “Lyco the philosopher said that education is an inviolate sanctuary” (16). The saying is found in at least five other anthologies, and in some of these the attribution is to Glyco.⁶⁷ There is also variation in the position of εἶναι: in some anthologies the copulative occurs before ἱερὸν ἄσυλον, and in one it is omitted.⁶⁸ The

⁶⁵ Unlike nos. 164 = 16 and 165 = 17, which in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* occur between sayings attributed to Bion and Gorgias, no. 403 = 18 comes last in the list of sayings attributed to persons whose name begins with lambda.

⁶⁶ Gottschalk (1973) 95 compares the saying with one attributed to Aristotle in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* no. 144 = no. 64 Searby: Ἀριστοτέλης θεασάμενος μεῖράκιον ὠραιζόμενον, “οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ,” ἔφη, “ὅτι τῆς φύσεως ἄνδρα σε ποιησάσης ἑαυτὸν τεθήλυκας;,” “When Aristotle saw a young man all decked out, he said, ‘Aren’t you ashamed that while nature made you a man, you have made yourself a woman?’” The general idea behind the two sayings is similar: men should be men and women women. But the saying attributed to Aristotle is addressed to a man; that attributed to Lyco is addressed to a woman and concerns both men and women.

⁶⁷ See the *apparatus* of parallel passages to text 16.

⁶⁸ The anthology that omits εἶναι is that of Arsenius Apostolius. It dates from the Renaissance and well illustrates how over time a saying undergoes changes in style.

phrase ἱερὸν ἄσυλον is a metaphor,⁶⁹ which gains in prominence if it completes the saying, with the most important word, ἄσυλον, coming last. In contrast, if εἶναι occupies the final position, the saying has a weaker ending. Omitting εἶναι produces brevity, though perhaps not a more eloquent saying than that in which εἶναι precedes ἱερὸν ἄσυλον. For placing an unimportant word before the metaphor creates a timely pause, which makes the subsequent metaphor even more imposing. Be that as it may,⁷⁰ the saying suits what we know of Lyco—his interest in education (1.2–3) and his reputation for elegance (here, metaphor)—and given the unity of attribution in the various collections, I am inclined to see in text **16** an authentic saying of Lyco.⁷¹ But the unity of attribution may only reflect Lyco's reputation among anthologists; by itself it cannot take us back to the Hellenistic period.

4: Text 7

In contrast to the eleven sayings discussed above, five from Diogenes and six from anthologies, there is one remark attributed to Lyco that unquestionably concerns particular individuals and therefore may be called anecdotal.⁷² It is found in the 21st Oration of Themistius (4th c. A.D.), where Lyco and Aristo are mentioned together, in order to illustrate the way in which true philosophers relate to each other. We are told that Lyco's reputation in regard to education was so impressive that enemies at sea stayed away from his ships as if they were holy; neverthe-

⁶⁹ For a non-metaphorical occurrence of ἱερὸν ἄσυλον, see Polybius 4.18.10, cited by LSJ s.v. ἄσυλος II.

⁷⁰ The infinitive construction depends upon ἔλεγεν and therefore is the work of an anthologist or his source (some prose writer reporting a remark of Lyco). What position the copulative originally occupied—presumably in the form ἐστὶ—can only be guessed at.

⁷¹ Cf. Gottschalk (1973) 94–5, who says that the saying “is almost certainly genuine.” He compares the saying with a related one attributed to Aristotle by D.L. 5.19 = no. 24 Searby: τὴν παιδείαν ἔλεγεν ἐν ταῖς εὐτυχίαις εἶναι κόσμον, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἀτυχίαις καταφυγὴν, “He used to say that education in good fortune is an adornment and in bad fortune a refuge.” For discussion of the Aristotelian saying, see Searby (1998) 177–8.

⁷² For two of the sayings previously considered, 1.17–20 and **18**, a context is indicated, but it is not made particular by reference to named individuals. That is not the case with text **7**. Here individuals are named, so that the context together with the saying of Lyco may be said to constitute an anecdote.

less, Lyco was not grieved when he noticed Aristo making better progress (in Aristotelian studies) through hard work (7.4–10). Instead, “he admitted with playfulness and charm that the lame outruns the sound of foot”: συνωμολόγει μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ χαρίτων ὅτι ὁ χωλὸς τὸν ἀρτίποδα παρατρέχει (10–12).⁷³ The idea that Lyco concerned himself with education is already familiar to us from texts previously discussed, but the report concerning enemies at sea occurs nowhere else and is difficult to interpret. In any case, our concern is with Lyco’s admission that he had been outstripped by Aristo. Themistius tells us that Lyco made the admission with playfulness and charm. That assessment is correct. Playing with the fact that Aristo had a crippled leg, Lyco introduces a comparison with the lame and the sound of foot: the former is said to outrun the latter. The charm of the comparison depends partly on brevity. A four term analogy is assumed and turned upside down. Given Lyco’s good reputation in regard to education, one would expect the analogy, if it were spelled out, to take the following form: As Lyco, a man respected in regard to education, relates to Aristo, so the sound of foot relates to the lame. And since the sound of foot outruns the lame, we would expect Lyco to outrun Aristo in matters of education.⁷⁴ But instead, it is Aristo who outruns Lyco in the study of philosophy. That is unexpected, and combined with the brevity of Lyco’s admission (five words including two definite articles), the surprise is charming. In addition, the important word, “outruns,” comes last, which increases the surprise and with it the charm. And when we transfer in our minds “outruns” to Aristo and Lyco, we are recognizing an implicit metaphor, “outruns” replaces “learns better,” and that too increases the charm of Lyco’s admission. We have, then, in Lyco’s words an excellent example

⁷³ In translating the Greek into English, it is tempting to render with the past tense, “outran,” for in English a verb of saying in the past tense is most often followed by indirect discourse in the past tense, even though the reported discourse was originally expressed in the present tense. Here, however, I prefer to resist the temptation, for Lyco’s words may be more than a simple admission of fact: the lame Aristo outran him despite his (Lyco’s) soundness of foot. Lyco’s words may also be a paradoxical generalization: the lame outrun(s) the sound of foot. The idea would be equivalent to, e.g., the tortoise outruns the hare.

⁷⁴ The expectation is based on a hypothetical argument through analogy: As A is to B, so C is to D; but A is R to B; therefore C is R to D. This kind of hypothetical syllogism was investigated by Theophrastus and Eudemus (see Fortenbaugh [2000b] 72) and will have been known to Aristo, whatever his shortcomings as a philosopher may have been.

of charming expression and one which fits well with Peripatetic doctrine. We may compare the work *On Style* by Demetrius Rhetor. The author may not have been a Peripatetic himself, but in discussing charm, he draws on Peripatetic sources, perhaps Theophrastus,⁷⁵ and makes clear that brevity (137), the unexpected (152), final position (139), and metaphor (142) are important to the effect.

The comparison drawn by Lyco calls attention to Aristo's physical disability, but it is not offensive. As Themistius observes, Lyco harbors no bad feelings toward Aristo (8–10). In fact, Lyco has turned his wit against himself and done so in good taste. He appears not to be Aristotle's buffoon, who cannot resist making a joke, even at his own expense (*NE* 4.8 1128a34–5). Rather, he comes across as a cultivated or charming, χαρίεις (1128a31, b1), individual who knows how to admit his own failings. Of course, a single remark is not sufficient to demonstrate a consistent character, but no counterexamples are reported.⁷⁶

In the two preceding paragraphs, I have spoken of Lyco's words as if they were an authentic saying. That can be doubted. We can, for example, imagine someone attributing the saying to Lyco, because he knew of his reputation both for elegance in speech and for life apart from philosophy. A person of such reputation might well be surpassed by a student, and he might acknowledge as much in a clever saying. Nevertheless, Lyco himself may have recorded the story and thereby impressed Themistius with his generosity. Alternatively and more probably, Aristo may have told the story in a biography of Lyco.⁷⁷ But if he did, is he likely to have reproduced with accuracy what Lyco actually said? I withhold judgment and say simply that the words attributed to Lyco fit the tradition and may well be authentic.

⁷⁵ See now Innes (1995) 328 n. 31 and the literature cited there.

⁷⁶ It might be objected that simply calling attention to a physical disability or deformity exhibits bad taste and causes pain. That may be true in some cultures, but it is not true of ancient Greece. I refer to Plutarch, who first tells us that men laugh when they are teased about a hooked or snub nose, and then reports that Cassander was not offended when Theophrastus said to him, "I am amazed at your eyes, for they do not sing, though your nose gives the pitch" (*Table Talk* 2.19 633B = 31 FHS&G). Much depends on the situation. Among people who know each other and share feelings of goodwill, laughter is easily aroused (ps.-Aristotle, *Problems* 28.8 950a18–21), but no offense need occur. See Fortenbaugh (2000a) 351.

⁷⁷ See text 23.6–7 and above, Section 2 *ad init.*

5: Text 12

Very different from the sayings already discussed is a description of the drunkard preserved for us by Rutilius Lupus, a Latin rhetorician whose floruit may be assigned to the last years of the principate of Augustus. His work *De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis*, *On Figures of Thought and Style*, is a partial translation of a larger work by the Greek rhetorician Gorgias of Athens, who was for a short time a tutor of Cicero's son.⁷⁸ It has been suggested that Rutilius' work, as we now have it, is an epitome of or excerpts from an originally larger work, but the suggestion has been disputed. For our purposes, it is sufficient to recognize that the work is not a complete translation of what Gorgias wrote, and that some material has been lost through transmission. We may cite, e.g., the accounts of *ethopoia* (1.21) and *antimetabole* (1.6). As a rule each figure is first defined and then illustrated, but in the case of the former, we have illustrative material without a definition (1.21), and in the case of the latter, the manuscripts actually exhibit an initial lacuna (1.6).

Our concern is with the figure *charakterismos* (2.7 = 12). It is introduced as follows: "In the way that a painter uses colors to represent figures, so the orator uses this figure to delineate either the vices or virtues of those about whom he speaks" (2–4). After that comes the name of Lyco and a lengthy characterization of the drunkard.⁷⁹ It is clear that the characterization is intended to illustrate *charakterismos* and that Lyco is named as its author. What we miss is any adjective or qualifying clause which explicitly identifies this Lyco with the Peripatetic philosopher. Nevertheless the identification is not to be doubted. It was first made by Ruhnken and has been universally accepted.⁸⁰

Rutilius' text presents a single scene, in which a drunkard plays host to persons who also are given to excessive drinking. The scene is organized with considerable care: first, we are treated to a description of the drunkard as he awakens from an alcohol induced sleep; second, we hear

⁷⁸ For a full discussion of Rutilius and Gorgias, see Münscher (1912) 1604–19, and for briefer remarks, see Brooks (1970) xiv.

⁷⁹ The sketch of the drunkard is in fact the longest of the examples presented by Rutilius.

⁸⁰ Ruhnken (1768) 99, Münscher (1912) 1609–10, Capelle (1927) 2305–6, and Brooks (1970) 86–7.

of his inability to stand up; third, there is a vivid description of the drunkard being supported and taken to the dinning room,⁸¹ where he destroys his judgment through renewed drinking and then attacks his own guests;⁸² fourth, the behavior of the guests within the house is described; fifth, we hear of a guest outside the house; sixth, having been left alone by the guests, the host is said to fall asleep while drinking. Each of the sections is clearly marked by an introductory word: *primum* (8), *deinde* (10), *tandem* (12), *interea* (22), *interea* (29), *novissime* (31). If there is anything to complain of here, it is that the second occurrence of *interea* seems oddly repetitive, for none of the other introductory words is repeated. It may also seem unnecessary—why create a separate section for a single guest who happens to be outside?—and even disruptive, for it breaks up a string of sentences concerning individual guests, each introduced by either *alius* or *alium*.⁸³ Be that as it may, the description of the guests is important to the sketch, for it not only enlarges the picture of what occurs in the house of the drunkard, but also helps us to appreciate the final section, which begins with the words *novissime solus in triclinio relictus*, “Finally, left alone in the dinning room” (31). After the series of statements concerning individual guests, we recognize immediately that the drunkard has accomplished his goal. He has defeated his several guests through drinking and thereby won a great victory (20–2). He continues drinking, and as the last words tell

⁸¹ The sentence in question begins with *duobus innixus* and ends with *in triclinium trahitur* (12–17). Out of context the final words might be translated “he drags himself into the dining room,” but given that the drunkard is explicitly said to be supported by two persons, the translation “he is dragged” or “hauled” or “transported into the dining room” might be better. Indeed, not only is the drunkard said to be supported, but also his knees are described as sunken, *summissis genibus* (15). Apparently the effects of last night have left him so weak that he cannot drag himself into the dining room, at least not without the help of others who may be said to haul or transport him. Once in the dining room he begins drinking and that initially restores his strength, until he is once again rendered unconscious by alcohol.

⁸² In choosing the word “attack,” I am thinking not only of the comparison with a battle against enemies (20–2), but also the description of the drunkard as one who with drinking *provocat* and *laccessit* (20). In this context, we should not think of a mere summoning of boon companions and a challenge to join in the drinking. Rather, we should think of provocation and assault. Cf. *laccessit* in line 25.

⁸³ I would like to say that the second *interea* was introduced by Rutilius, who for some reason found the distinction between inside and outside significant. But that would be pure speculation.

us, the cup slips from his hands as he falls asleep.⁸⁴ One cannot help recalling Socrates in Plato's *Symposium*. He, too, outlasts the other drinkers, but instead of falling asleep and dropping his cup, Socrates remains upright and walks away (222D6–12).⁸⁵

In addition to having a clear structure, the sketch exhibits a clever use of details, some of which are to be expected in any extended portrait of a drunkard. We hear that with difficulty he awakens at mid-day (7–8); the condition of his eyes is fully described (9–10); when he finally rises from the bed, he is said to be supported by two persons and to be transported into the dining room (12–17).⁸⁶ There his behavior is described briefly but in a telling manner. Through drinking he is said to hasten to drive sense from his mind (18–20). Apparently his drunkenness is more than an habitual condition. It is also a preferred condition, which he keenly pursues. In addition, we are told that he abuses his guests thinking that he will win a great victory (20–2). We understand that he sees his behavior in a positive light. The description reveals choice, *προαίρεσις*, which places it squarely within the Aristotelian tradition.⁸⁷

One detail merits special mention, for it has prompted editors to see corruption and to either emend the text or to introduce daggers. I am thinking of the word *pauci* (17), which the most recent editor, Edward Brooks, obelizes.⁸⁸ It occurs in the third section, where we are told that guests are present in the dinning room when the drunkard is brought in. The guests are described as *quotidiani pauci eodem studio excitati convivae*, “a few regular companions aroused with the same zeal.” It is understandable that the word *pauci* has been deemed corrupt, for we are immediately told that the drunkard imagines winning a great victory by

⁸⁴ In the Latin version, the last four words *ipsum poculum suapte natura dormienti excidit* (33–4) are memorable. The cup is not put down; rather, of its own weight, as the drunkard sleeps, it falls. With *excidit* coming last, one all but hears the cup hit the floor. The word order is Latin and that of Rutilius; it cannot be attributed to Lyco.

⁸⁵ When Socrates leaves, he is followed by Aristodemus, who had fallen asleep much earlier and awoke shortly before Socrates' departure.

⁸⁶ The very number of descriptive details is worth noting. Between the introductory word *tandem* and the main part of the sentence beginning with *protinus*, there are by my count nine descriptive words or phrases.

⁸⁷ Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 3.16 1417a15–27, where choice is discussed in relation to narration.

⁸⁸ See Brooks' discussion on (1970) 87–8. It is, I think, to Wehrli's credit that he prints *pauci* in his text. He might, however, have listed some of the more plausible conjectures in his *apparatus criticus* or in his comment on the text (p. 26).

defeating as many guests as possible (20–2), and when the behavior of the guests is described, we get a list of particular acts marked off by the use of *alius* and *alium* (24–31). The list is not said to be exhaustive, so that one can imagine a large number of guests, each engaged in some act of bizarre or destructive behavior. Nevertheless, I am not convinced that *pauci* is corrupt, and in context it may actually be preferable, for it creates a telling contrast with what follows. The drunkard is said to drive out reason through drinking, after which he is said to attack his guests, thinking that by conquering many he will win a great victory. If I understand correctly, the drunkard's mental state is quite out of line with reality. His fellow drinkers are few, but having destroyed his mind with drink, he imagines himself fighting against a large army. Moreover, the list of particular acts by individual guests need not be construed as open-ended. Five guests, four within and one outside, may be all or nearly all there are. Indeed, it is not likely that a drunkard would find a large number of guests, even boon companions, present at mid-day. A few, *pauci*, seems more reasonable, and such a number creates a fine contrast with the victory which the drunkard imagines himself winning.

In addition to a clear structure and conscious use of detail, the sketch of the drunkard also exhibits stylistic features. Here, however, we must be careful, for *charakterismos* is on the whole not a matter of diction and composition, but rather of describing someone in terms of appearance and behavior.⁸⁹ Accordingly, Rutilius need not have done a word for word translation; indeed, he was for the most part free to add to or to improve upon the style of Lyco's text.⁹⁰ Keeping that in mind, I offer the following comments. The sketch begins with a rhetorical question (4–6) and exhibits heavy use of the ablative case (9–11). The former is likely to reflect what Lyco wrote, but the latter may not reflect the Greek original; it may have (and in my judgment is likely to have) entered through translation.⁹¹ The use of asyndeton in describing the drunkard (12–15) may be the work of Rutilius, but that is not necessary, and I prefer to think that Lyco himself introduced asyndeton, both in

⁸⁹ See Artaza (1994) 163.

⁹⁰ See Münscher (1912) 1609, quoting Ruhnken (1768) xix.

⁹¹ Rutilius' choice of the ablative construction might reflect Lyco's use of the Greek genitive absolute, but I am inclined to believe that Rutilius' use of the ablative has no such direct connection with the Greek original.

order to emphasize the number of attributes being listed (nine by my count) and with a view to enhancing oral presentation (cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 3.12 1413b19, 29–34). Similarly, the repetition of *alius*, both nominative and accusative, at the beginning of five consecutive sentences (24–9) may be the work of Rutilius, who earlier in his book discusses the figure of *epibole* (1.7).⁹² But it is equally likely, perhaps more so, that Rutilius is carefully reproducing what he found in the Greek original. Indeed, by employing *epibole*, Lyco will again have prepared the way for an enhanced oral presentation (cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 3.12 1413b19–28).

If the preceding analysis is not wide of the mark, we can say that Rutilius has preserved for us in translation an attractive sketch of the drunkard. But why did Lyco compose the sketch? It has been suggested that the opening sentence—“What remnant of good hope should I think remaining in the man who conducts the whole span of his life with one and the most desperate habit?” (4–6)—reveals an ethical concern, and that the sketch was written for a lost work entitled *On Drunkenness*.⁹³ Four other Peripatetics, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Chamaeleon, and Hieronymus,⁹⁴ are said to have written works with this title, so that it is easy to imagine Lyco doing the same. Moreover, Lyco had a reputation for holding parties (8.3–41) and may have been attracted to the topic of drunkenness. Indeed, it has been suggested that Lyco based his sketch on personal experience.⁹⁵ That is, of course, possible, but such a biographical interpretation can be neither proved nor disproved. More importantly, the idea that the opening sentence points to an ethical work like *On Drunkenness* is open to question. To be sure, the sentence concerns the character of the drunkard, but I see no reason why such a sentence, a forceful rhetorical question, could not begin a display piece, which Lyco composed for use in teaching rhetoric. We can imagine him

⁹² *Epibole* is a transliteration of the Greek ἐπιβολή, which is an alternative name for ἐπαναφορά. Rutilius recognizes two kinds of *epibole*: in one, the same word is placed at the beginning of several different sentences; in the other, different words with the same meaning are placed at the beginning (1.7.1–3). In regard to the former, he gives an example taken from a lost speech of the orator Lycurgus. In the Latin translation, *ego* comes first three times (1.7.6–8); in the Greek original, ἐγώ will have occurred. Cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 3.12 1413b27.

⁹³ Brink (1940) 933, cf. Fortenbaugh (1984) 94–5.

⁹⁴ Aristotle fr. 103–4, 106–8, 110–11 Rose; Theophrastus 1, 569–70, 572–6 FHS&G; Chamaeleon fr. 9–13 Wehrli; Hieronymus 28–9 White.

⁹⁵ Capelle (1927) 2306.

both reading the sketch aloud to his students and permitting it to circulate for close study. Alternatively, the opening sentence may have introduced a sketch written primarily for entertainment. There may have been a collection of such sketches which could be enjoyed at symposia or in a more private setting. I leave the matter undecided.⁹⁶

6: Conclusion

We have now looked at eleven sayings and one anecdotal remark. Stylistic features abound. There are metaphors and comparisons, balanced clauses and chiasmus, and in some cases admirable brevity. Such features are the mark of a φραστικός ἀνὴρ. We have also looked at a sketch of the drunkard. Attention to structure and detail is clear. Stylistic features like asyndeton and *epibole* are present and of interest in that they can be the basis of an effective delivery. That fits with Diogenes' picture of Lyco as someone who was at his best in oral presentation. We should, however, keep in mind that our evidence is meager and by no means uniform in reliability. The sayings recorded by Diogenes and the anecdote reported by Themistius may well be genuine, but among the sayings found in anthologies, one is definitely spurious and several almost certainly did not originate with Lyco.⁹⁷ In addition, the description of the drunkard comes to us in Latin translation, and in places it may have been enhanced by the translator. We must, then, be cautious in claiming to have a sense of the style of the historical Lyco. What we can assert is that the available evidence fits well with the tradition according to which Lyco was *oratione locuples*.

⁹⁶ A certain similarity to Theophrastus' *Characters* is undeniable (Ruhnken [1768] 99, Münscher [1912] 1609–10 and Capelle [1927] 2306), but since the original purpose of the *Characters* is by no means clear (Fortenbaugh [1984] 93–6), the similarity does little to decide why Lyco composed a sketch of the drunkard. Moreover, the sketches by Theophrastus are on the whole different from the sketch by Lyco: the former illustrate a character trait with a series of individual acts; in contrast, the latter presents a single scene. There is, however, an exception among the sketches by Theophrastus: namely, that of the fabrication, λογοποιία (8), which presents a single scene and therefore may be said to anticipate Lyco's sketch of the drunkard.

⁹⁷ We should also keep in mind that the sayings are marked by stylistic features which are typical of the genre and therefore are not strong indicators of Lyco's own peculiar style. See above, n. 36.

Works Cited

- Artaza, E. 1994. "Charakterismos," in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* 2: col. 163–6.
- Bosworth, A. 1970. "Aristotle and Callisthenes," *Historia* 19: 407–13.
- Brink, K. 1940. "Peripatos," *RE Suppl.* 7: col. 933 (Stuttgart: Metzler).
- Brooks, E. 1970. *P. Rutilii Lupi De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis = Mnemosyne Suppl.* 11 (Leiden: Brill).
- Capelle, W. 1927. "Lykon" 14, in *RE* 13: col. 2303–8 (Stuttgart: Metzler).
- Casaubon, I. 1616. "Notae ad Diogenis Laertii libros de vitis, dictis et decretis principum philosophorum," editio altera, in *Diogenis Laertii De vitis, dogmatis et apophthegmatis clarorum philosophorum, Libri X* (Genevae: Oliva Pauli Stephani).
- Dorandi, T. 1999. *Antigone de Caryste: Fragments* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Fortenbaugh, W. 1984. *Quellen zur Ethik Theophrasts* (Amsterdam: Grüner).
- . 1986. "Aristotle's Platonic Attitude toward Delivery," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 19:242–54.
- . 2000a. "Une analyse du rire chez Aristote et Théophraste," in *Le rire des Grecs. Anthropologie du rirer in Grèce ancienne*, ed. M.-L. Desclos (Grenoble: Jérôme Millon), 333–54.
- . 2000b. "Teofrasto di Ereso: Argomentazione retorica e sillogistica ipotetica," *Aevum* 74: 89–103.
- Fortenbaugh, W. and S. White, eds. Forthcoming. *Aristo of Ceos: Texts, Translation, and Discussion*. RUSCH 13 (New Brunswick: Transaction).
- Gottschalk, H. 1973. "Addenda Peripatetica," *Phronesis* 18: 91–100.
- Gutas, D. 1975. *Greek Wisdom Literature in Arabic Translation: A study of the Graeco-Arabic Gnomologia = American Oriental Series* 60 (New Haven: American Oriental Society).
- Hansen, M. H. 1991. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles and Ideology*. Trans. J. A. Cook (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Ihm, S. 2001. *Ps.-Maximus Confessor. Erste kritische Edition einer Redaktion des sacro-profanen Florilegiums Loci communes* (Stuttgart: Steiner).

- Innes, D. 1995. *Demetrius, On Style*, in Loeb Classical Library vol. 199: 309–525 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard).
- Münscher, K. 1912. “Gorgias” 9, in *RE* 14: col. 1604–19 (Stuttgart: Metzler).
- Phillips, M. ed. 1977. *Loci Communes of Maximus the Confessor, Vaticanus Graecus 739* (St. Louis, MO: Diss.)
- Riedweg, Chr. 1999. “Lykon” 5 in *Der Neue Pauly* 5: col. 567 (Stuttgart: Metzler).
- Ruhnken, D. 1768. *P. Rutilii Lupi De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis, Libri duo* (Leiden: Luchtmans).
- Schenkl, H. 1888. “Die epiktetischen Fragmente,” *SBWien* 115: 443–546.
- . 1889. “Das Florilegium ”Αριστον καὶ Πρῶτον Μάθημα,” *Wiener Studien* 11: 1–42.
- Searby, D. 1998. *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition* = *Studia Graeca Upsaliensia* 19 (Stockholm: Gotab).
- Sollenberger, M. 1984. *Diogenes Laertius’ Life of Theophrastus: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text with a Translation and Commentary* (Diss.: New Brunswick, NJ).
- . 1992. “The Lives of the Peripatetics: An Analysis of the Contents and Structure of Diogenes Laertius’ ‘Vitae philosophorum’ Book 5,” in *ANRW* II 36.6: 3793–879.
- Wehrli, F. 1968. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 6: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (Basel: Schwabe).
- White, S. 1995. “Cicero and the Therapists,” in *Cicero the Philosopher*, ed. J. Powell (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 219–46.
- . 2002. “Happiness in the Hellenistic Lyceum,” *Apeiron* Suppl. 35: 69–93.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1881. *Antigonos von Karystos* = *Philologische Untersuchungen* 4 (Berlin: Weidemann).

11

Hieronymus on Isocrates' Style

David C. Mirhady

I begin with an admission. For the longest time I could not bring myself to read Isocrates seriously. Despite being aware of his importance as a rhetorician and intellectual in the fourth century, every attempt of mine to read his most important works, such as *Antidosis*, *Panegyricus*, or *Panathenaicus* resulted in such complete boredom that the attempt was abandoned. I really only got past this situation when I took on the task of translating Isocrates, and now thankfully I can read him with some appreciation.¹

I offer this admission because I think that my experience with Isocrates is not so unlike that of Hieronymus and other ancient critics. While admiring Isocrates for many qualities, critics are unexcited with his style, which results at times in an impatient tone in their writings about him. Modern Anglo-American scholarship seems to bear out this ambivalence. Without the publication of two very recent books, there would not have been a single book in English on Isocrates in the entire twentieth century. The attitudes of the Peripatetics to Isocrates must also have been ambivalent — his understanding of philosophy and teaching ran contrary to that of both Plato and Aristotle — but there is little explicit criticism of him in Aristotle's works, and Aristotle cites

¹ See now Mirhady and Too (2000).

Isocrates several times on points of style, describing his writing as pleasant.²

In this paper I wish to unpack the remarks of Hieronymus on Isocrates' style that have been recorded both by Philodemus and by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (**38A–B** White). Philodemus gives the more complete text of the fragment, but Dionysius gives a clear indication of where the reliance on Hieronymus ends. It is possible that Dionysius relies on Philodemus for the fragment, but it is also possible that they both rely on a common source, perhaps Crates of Mallus.³ The language of Hieronymus recurs several times in Dionysius' accounts of Isocrates' style, which suggests that Hieronymus had a wider influence on the later critic's appraisal of Isocrates than is immediately apparent from the short passage. Hieronymus decries the fact that while readable, Isocrates' speeches do not lend themselves to public declamation. Of course Isocrates had never made the claim that they did, but that may be beside the point.⁴ Based on his stylistic criticism, Hieronymus moves on to criticize both Isocrates' pedagogy and his role in politics, at least implicitly. Using vivid language, he argues that students must be trained in public declamation, including delivery. Isocrates' method of circulating written texts is thus implicitly criticized.

Underlying Hieronymus' criticisms of Isocrates, there seems to be a democratic polemic, which raises the question of Hieronymus' Rhodian roots. Having driven off a year-long siege by Demetrius Poliorcetes in 305/4 (Diod. 20.80–100), Rhodes in the third century was arguably a democracy. Somewhat like democratic Athens in the classical period, Rhodes enjoyed prosperous maritime trade and a strong fleet manned by citizen sailors.⁵ Many of our sources derive from periods later than Hieronymus, but they seem entirely sufficient to show that Hieronymus could have developed a "democratic" consciousness at Rhodes.

² *Rhet.* 1410a20–1 refers specifically to Isocrates' antitheses; cf. Theophrastus 692 FHS&G.

³ See Janko (1995) 93 n. 131 and 140.

⁴ Usher (by personal correspondence) points out that Philodemus and Dionysius are drawing attention to their own programs, which involve training young men for public careers in politics and the courts. Dionysius is eclectic, identifying characteristics of different models that the pupil might imitate.

⁵ See Berthold (1984) 38–45, O'Neil (1981) 468–73, and Gabrielsen (1997) 24–31. Aristotle recognized that there were both democratic and anti-democratic elements in Rhodes (*Pol.* 5.3 1302b21–33, 5.5 1304b27–31).

It is important not to ignore the distinctions between written and oral discourse that the ancient critics made. In Plato's *Phaedrus* (274B–278C), for instance, writing is criticized as destructive to memory (275A), incapable of dialogue (275D–E), and inappropriate for serious matters (277E). In Alcidamas' polemic *On the Writers of Written Discourses or On the Sophists*, which is believed by some to have been directed against Isocrates,⁶ the central weakness of a training in written discourse is that it leaves the student incapable of extemporaneous speech (8). Written compositions with their elaborate diction and artificiality, Alcidamas says, lack spontaneity and thus engender ill will in the listener (12). Isocrates' own view associates extemporaneous speech with the sort of litigiousness that he condemns in general (15.30–49). Written discourse, and especially his own, is meant for issues of broader importance. Aristotle makes a distinction between written and agonistic style, and subdivides the latter into *demegoric* and *dicanic* (*Rhet.* 1413b1–5). In his use of the term *demegoric* rather than *sumbouleutic*, he seems to be anticipating Hieronymus. For Aristotle, the strength of written speech is in accuracy, whereas the strength of agonistic speech is in delivery.⁷

Hieronymus passes over many of these distinctions. He betrays no interest in memory, dialectic, extemporaneity, diction, or accuracy. His central point is that Isocrates' style suppresses the possibility of effective oral *delivery* before a democratic crowd. In his cursory treatment (*Rhet.* 1403b20–4a8), Aristotle notes that there was yet to be a treatise on delivery (1403b21), but that those who master volume, harmony, and rhythm take most of the prizes in political speeches because of the baseness (μολοχθρία) of the citizens. Delivery, for Aristotle, was not a suitable subject for rhetoric, since it went beyond verbal reasoning; but it was necessary since it affected opinion (δόξα, 1404a2).⁸

⁶ For bibliography, see now Mariss (2002) 26–55.

⁷ See now Graff (2001).

⁸ Wehrli (1969) 43 remarks that Hieronymus follows the tradition of stylistic criticism of the Peripatos, noting that he is consistent with remarks of Demetrius of Phalerum (F134 SOD), and asserts that his remarks rest on the Aristotelian distinction between written and agonistic style (*Rhet.* 1413b3–5). But we can be more precise than this. The Hieronymus passage, while employing the same basic distinction between lectoral (i.e. for reading; cf. Quintil. 2.5.6) and declamatory style, is emphatic in its denunciation of the former and of Isocrates in particular.

Text **37A** from Cicero's *Orator* suggests that Hieronymus had done a painstaking stylistic analysis of at least some of Isocrates' writings. Cicero accuses him of playing fast and loose with the evidence, and the tone of our text suggests that it is part of a polemic.

Hieronymus begins by stating that someone can read Isocrates' speeches well (καλῶς), presumably meaning "easily." It seems important to recognize that the act of reading mentioned here (ἀναγνῶναι) can refer both to the process of orally reproducing the sounds of the letters and to the understanding of what is written. Silent reading seems not yet to be conceived. When Hieronymus says that the reading may be done with ease, he may be referring both to oral reproduction and to understanding. If the latter, he would presumably grant that Isocrates' writing is clear and that it uses good Greek, thereby granting Isocrates some of the traditional virtues of style.

Hieronymus takes issue with Isocrates' speeches because they do not allow "public declamation," as I translate δημηγορήσαι, in particular because they are not in accord with the sort of delivery needed in this context. Isocrates himself does not use the verb very often, and when he does, he generally disparages the activity.⁹ Aristotle uses the term as a synonym for deliberative oratory as distinct from forensic (*Rhet.* 1354b20–5). Hieronymus assumes that the point of speeches (λόγοι) is public declamation (δημηγορήσαι). Yun Lee Too has recently taken issue with this approach, arguing for the legitimacy of Isocrates' scheme to create a political discourse of written texts.¹⁰ Hieronymus, who only has access to the speeches of the great fourth-century orators through their writings, nevertheless seems to assume that oral discourse is the fundamental medium of politics. So despite Isocrates' repeated admission in his writings that he does not have the voice or temperament for the oral delivery of speeches—that his writings are *meant* to be read and not heard in public assemblies¹¹—Hieronymus asserts his argument as if Isocrates' works were actually meant for public declamation. And it must be admitted that there are passages in which Isocrates mentions people speaking and hearing speeches such as his.¹²

⁹ See Isoc. 8.9, 75, 12.12, 29.

¹⁰ Too (1995).

¹¹ Isoc. 5.11, 81, 85, 12.1, 10, 15.9, 46, *Ep.* 8.7.

¹² See e.g. Isoc. 5.155; 12.38, 136; 15.141. See also Hudson-Williams (1949).

Public declamation requires raising the voice and intensity. Hieronymus is thinking about both volume and intensity (τόνος), two distinct factors. Loudness is required because of the large crowds involved in demagogic speech, and raised intensity is needed to convey emotion. Translation of the term κατασκευή is problematic. Does it refer to the artistry of the speaker or to the occasion on which he is speaking? The word recurs later in the text (καὶ πλάσμα καὶ τὴν ἄλλην κατασκευὴν δημηγόρου περιβαλλόμενον), where it appears to refer to the accoutrement of the speaker, specifically something he creates for himself with his speech. I would attempt to use the same English word in both passages and choose “fashion.” The Greek term often means something like “equipment” or “tools.” “Fashion” likewise connotes a human artifact, a tool to be used, but it also reflects the manner in which something is done, a meaning that is suggested here. It is the fashion of public declamation. The demonstrative τούτῃ refers back, I think, to the verb δημηγορήσαι.

The delivery must fit, or be in harmony with, the fashion of the speech. In language that corresponds closely with this passage and later parts of the fragment, Aristotle warns against too close a fit between the words and the voice and face, or mask, of the speaker: ἐὰν τὰ ὀνόματα σκληρὰ ᾖ, μὴ καὶ τῇ φωνῇ καὶ τῷ προσώπῳ [καὶ] τοῖς ἀρμόττουσιν (*Rhet.* 1408b7–8). The κατασκευή is thus not simply the words, nor should we equate it with the “style” (λέξις) of the speech, since Hieronymus also uses that term in a distinct way. It is more appropriately associated with the mask or *prosopon* of a political advisor or a public speaker.

To explain why public declamation of Isocrates' speeches is impossible, Hieronymus asserts that Isocrates has left out or disregarded the most important and “crowd-moving” element. We are led to ask what the “most crowd-moving” element is and are drawn to the conclusion that it must be delivery, or rather that aspect of style that facilitates public delivery. In this regard, Hieronymus appears to concur with both Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1403b26–8) and Theophrastus (712 and 719A FHS&G).¹³ Theophrastus connects delivery with a knowledge of the emotions of the soul and with both vocal intensity and bodily move-

¹³ Fortenbaugh (1985).

ment (cf. *Rhet.* 2.8 1386a33).¹⁴ In fact, with Cicero the idea that delivery is the first, second, and third most important element in rhetoric has become a commonplace.¹⁵ Dionysius, in *Dem.* 40.57, uses the phrase *κινητικώτατα τῶν ὅλγων* to refer to various stylistic devices, and then, surprisingly, cites Isocrates as an example of someone who uses them. The stylistic devices he refers to are typically Isocratean—parallelism, antithesis, and so on—and are not suggestive of Hieronymus' vocabulary.

In *Dem.* 17–20, however, Dionysius reviews some of the deficiencies in Isocrates' style and quotes a passage from *On the Peace*. Although conceding Isocrates' clarity, precision, and ordinary diction, he describes his style as sprawling, sluggish, and cowardly, and claims that he not only does not stir emotions but for the most part also does not wish to (*Dem.* 18). Like Hieronymus, Dionysius argues that the strongest weapon in forensic and deliberative oratory is to lead the listeners into an emotional state of mind. He describes Isocrates' manner of expression (*διάλεκτος*) as lifeless (*ἄψυχος*) because it is smooth (*λεῖος*) and soft (*μαλακός*).

Hieronymus cites three elements of Isocrates' speeches that prevent effective delivery in public declamation: they are lifeless, hard to listen to, and composed as if for a single intensity. The term "lifeless" seems to imply a lack of specifically emotional appeal. When Theophrastus asserts the importance of delivery, for instance, he associates it with *πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς* (712 FHS&G). The word *ἀνυπάκουστον* seems to be a *hapax*, but Dionysius says of Isocrates that "each period is fashioned through antitheses so as to exhaust (*ἀποκναίειν*) the listeners with disgust and excess" (*Dem.* 20). He seems to agree with Hieronymus on this point.

From Dionysius, *Isoc.* 2.22–32, it appears that the smoothness referred to is that achieved by avoiding hiatus (cf. *Dem.* 40.15):

[Isocrates] avoids placing vowels beside each other on the grounds that they break the harmony of the sounds and outrage the smoothness [*τὴν λειότητα*] of the utterances. He attempts to capture his thoughts by the circle and period by means of a rhythm-like pattern not very unlike poetic meter, and he is more suitable for *reading* than for practical use [*χρήσεως*]. His speeches therefore sustain [*φέρουσιν*] displays at festivals and viewing in hand [*τὴν ἐκ χειρὸς*]

¹⁴ Cf. Fortenbaugh (1985) 271, 285 n. 9.

¹⁵ Cf. *Brut.* 142, *Or.* 56, *De or.* 3.213.

θεωρίαν], but they do not endure contests in the assembly and law courts. The reason for this is that the emotional is most needed in those speeches, and a period least admits it.

Dionysius agrees with Hieronymus that Isocrates' style is better for reading than speaking because it lacks the passionate aspect needed for the courts and assembly. It wears out the listener (cf. Dion. *Isoc.* 3.23–6 and *De comp.* 19).¹⁶

Instead of the “interruption and diversity and distinctiveness [achieved] by tension and relaxation” that Hieronymus mentions, Aristotle mentions only asyndeton and repetition of words (*Rhet.* 1413b19–21). Both are meant, as Hieronymus' sentence makes clear, to disrupt the smoothness. Janko calls attention to the use of terms such as *epitasis* and *anêsis* only in Hieronymus and in Crates of Mallus, who makes clear that the terms derive from the musical pitch of the lyre-string or bow.¹⁷ It seems that Hieronymus has a more elaborate understanding of how stylistic devices may allow for techniques in delivery that convey emotional variation. Aristotle's terminology covers only grammar and syntax, but Hieronymus may be bringing in terms for musical effects. The terms *epitasis* and *anêsis* are actually used several times by Dionysius, however, where they seem to reflect variations in intensity used within a single stylistic type.¹⁸

The second part of the fragment makes a transition from style *per se* to its effects both on the speaker himself and on the rhetorical character that he might try to project while speaking. Aristotle states that a written work should generally be easy to read and therefore easy to deliver (*Rhet.* 3.5 1407b11–12). Hieronymus challenges this view.¹⁹ The text of this passage has been troublesome, but Hieronymus' basic point is clear, that Isocrates' periods constrain, or choke, a speaker who tries to declaim his speeches. The claim is a counterpart to that made about the listener who likewise cannot listen easily to the periodic structure. Aristotle appears not to have anticipated Hieronymus' criticism of periodic style. He contrasts it with the continuous (εἰρομένην, 1409a35). Unlike the continuous style, in the periodic style each period has a be-

¹⁶ Cf. Plato *Euthyd.* 305b.

¹⁷ Janko (1995) 93 compares *PHerc* 1073 fr. 15b.21 (= Tr. B fr. 10 Sbordone).

¹⁸ See *Dem.* 37.4, 44.4, 46.12, *De Comp.* 21.8, 21.22.

¹⁹ Aristotle does recognize that written compositions appear narrow (στενοί) when delivered in debates (1413b15).

ginning and end and a magnitude that can be easily grasped (1409a30–5). But the imagery Aristotle uses is worth comparing. He says that the continuous style is like a running course with an indeterminate finish line. The runner thus does not know how to pace himself. Hieronymus' point would seem to be that Isocrates' periods are so long that the speaker cannot make any sprints. Demetrius (*On Style* 193) advocates what he calls "the loosened style" (ἡ διαλελυμένη λέξις) as being the best in a contest, because the looseness promotes delivery, but he likewise grants that the written style is easy to read. The sorts of effects mentioned by Hieronymus would probably come under Demetrius' heading "looseness."

When Hieronymus mentions the removal of delivery, he appears to be echoing language of Aristotle (ἀφηρημένης τῆς ὑποκρίσεως, *Rhet.* 1413b18). Aristotle recognizes that when delivery is removed, speeches suited for delivery do not fulfil their proper function and appear silly. Aristotle is thinking of asyndeton and repetition. Hieronymus' claim is that Isocrates' style itself deprives the orator of delivery. Ironically, Isocrates appears to have agreed, although his language is slightly different. In his address to Philip (5.26–7), he writes:

for when the speech is robbed of the reputation of the speaker, his voice, and the variations which are made in the rhetorical delivery, . . . it seems trivial to the hearers. [ἐπειδὴν γὰρ ὁ λόγος ἀποστερηθῇ τῆς τε δόξης τῆς τοῦ λέγοντος καὶ τῆς φωνῆς καὶ τῶν μεταβολῶν τῶν ἐν ταῖς ῥητορείαις γιγνομένων . . . φαῦλος εἶναι δοκεῖ τοῖς ἀκούουσιν.]

Isocrates introduces the speaker's reputation, his *doxa*, as the first element here, referring not just to the immediate impression of the speaker, but to the reputation that he has built up over time (cf. 1.17, 2.7, 13.8, 15.184). Of course, the reputation and voice coincide here. Isocrates goes on to say that in this speech the problem is compounded by the lack of the ornamental trappings of rhythm and variety.

When Hieronymus wants to describe what is left of Isocrates' style without delivery, he temporarily drops the term δημηγορησαι and says instead that Isocrates' style is the opposite to that of political speeches (πολιτικῶν). It seems that Hieronymus recognizes that public declamation was disparaged by Isocrates, so he now uses the more generic term (cf. Isoc. 13.9 and 22). In the following clause he reiterates cognates of πόλις twice more, as well as recalling δημηγορικῇ. Hieronymus seems to recognize that Isocrates' method of avoiding the

typically political contexts of the assembly and law courts in favor of written discourse removed him from what was properly “political” discourse. Hieronymus, however, assimilates πολιτική and δημηγορική; for him an appeal to the *polis* is an appeal to the *dêmos*. Isocrates’ obsequious appeals to monarchs like Philip create suspicion about Isocrates’ commitment to the *polis* as a constitutional institution.

Hieronymus, by describing one who is “going” to preside over citizens (ἐπιστατήσονται), seems to be taking on Isocrates’ pedagogy. Isocrates himself makes clear in several of his discourses that his normal method of teaching was simply to write his works and offer them to his students as models (5.27). In the *Antidosis* (15.46–7), Isocrates argues that the sort of style he uses in speeches for the Panhellenic congresses is so poetic that they inspire a desire to emulate them. Isocrates portrays a pedagogy whereby students emulate his writings with their own. Hieronymus is rather suggesting that students learn by participating actively in the political processes.

I prefer to read κα[τα]κεχύσθαι as a middle voice. The student is “to let the political and demegoric style pour out from himself.”²⁰ The image of the student being “steeped in” that style is also attractive, but LSJ does not appear to give any precedents for it. Hieronymus appears to set up a contrast between the adjectives πολιτική and δημηγορική on the one hand, and ἐπιδίφριος and καταψιθυρίζουσα on the other. The vocabulary is unusual and evocative. The ἐπιδίφριος sits upon a car; he goes along for the ride. The word is also used of sedentary trades. Dionysius uses it of common tradespeople who work while sitting down (*Thuc.* 50). For him, two centuries later, it seems to connote a low social level. It suggests that Isocratean speeches might be hammered out by a group of tradesmen working at a bench. Likewise, καταψιθυρίζουσα indicates not only whispering speech, but whispering against (κατα-) someone. Hieronymus’ imagery suggests that Isocrates sat on the sidelines, or in a workshop, and whispered complaints against the political process.

With the imagery of a great and shaggy mask, Hieronymus may be contrasting an image of a thickly bearded man with a child’s voice. However, the collocation of the terms μέγα and δασύ occurs in

²⁰ Doreen Innes (by personal correspondence) points out to me the use of the term χύσις in Longinus 12.3–4, where the “profusion” of the styles of Plato and Cicero is contrasted with Demosthenes’ roughness.

Odyssey 14.51 to describe a goatskin on which Eumaeus invites Odysseus to sit (cf. *Od.* 13.437 of a skin that is *ψιλόν*, threadbare). If Hieronymus is referring to that passage, then the implication of the phrase may be simply of a mask that is rich and strong. Alternatively, the passage may suggest that Hieronymus has in mind a stock collection of masks or *prosôpa*, which might be used, for instance, on the comic stage (cf. Aristoph. *Thesm.* 33 and 160 ἀγρεῖον ὄντα καὶ δασύν) or in tragedy (cf. Soph. *Trach.* 557, where the centaur Nessus is described as shaggy-chested). Both contexts connect the hirsute with wildness. This possibility recalls Theophrastus' *Characters* and suggests that Hieronymus' interests in theater extended beyond the text and plot, which so interested Aristotle, to the spectacle of the play, which Aristotle describes as "artless," or at least not belonging to the poetic art (*Po.* 1450b17–18, 1453b1–6). When defining comedy, Aristotle actually mentions a laughable mask as something ugly and distorted, something that is socially scorned without causing pain (1449a35–40). The incongruence of the shaggy, great mask with the child's voice seems something out of comedy. Longinus, however, actually comes closest to Hieronymus' imagery, and he makes the connection to tragedy (30.2):

to clothe petty affairs with great and solemn words would seem just like putting a great, tragic mask upon an infant boy [τοῖς μικροῖς πραγματίοις περιτιθέναι μεγάλα καὶ σεμνὰ ὀνόματα ταῦτ' ἂν φαίνοιτο ὡς εἴ τις τραγικὸν προσωπεῖον μέγα παιδὶ περιθείη νηπίῳ].

Longinus' point is actually the opposite of Hieronymus', but the similarity of the language is striking.

Aristotle likens the *demegoric* style to shadow drawing (*Rhet.* 1414a8); there is the larger the crowd, the less need for precision and the greater the need for a loud voice (a18). Hieronymus' linking of the mask, a visual device used to help identify characters to large crowds, with the voice seems consistent with Aristotle's point.²¹ The use of the verb *περιθεῖναι* suggests a passage in which Isocrates likewise dresses the small with the great (4.8):

²¹ Cicero *De or.* 3.221 cites Theophrastus (713 FHS&G) about the importance of the eyes in delivery. He mentions an actor Roscius, who got less applause when he wore a mask because the audience could not see his face and eyes. Clearly, wearing a mask obscures the eyes.

It is possible to discourse on the same subject matter in many different ways—to represent the great as lowly or to invest the little with grandeur [τοῖς μικροῖς μέγεθος περιθεῖναι], to recount the things of old in a new manner or to set forth events of recent date in an old fashion.

Commentators have generally understood this formulation as Isocrates' way of stating the sophists' common claim "to make the weaker argument the stronger." Hieronymus' comment on this is clearly along the lines that investing one's views with grandeur obviously misfires when one's voice betrays the smallness of the argument. Longinus quotes this passage of Isocrates and condemns his "puerility" (παιδὸς πράγμα, 38) in dwelling on the power of rhetoric when leading up to his praise of Athens. His drawing of attention to his style arouses distrust of his sincerity. The shaggy mask may thus be seen as a sort of rich, poetic style, which Isocrates frustrates by limiting the speaker's range of vocal intensity.

Hieronymus reiterates his complaint about speaking with a child's voice through a great mask by criticizing Isocrates' own professed role as advisor to the Greeks. When Hieronymus describes Isocrates advising the Greeks, he uses a distinct verb, συμβουλεύειν, which suggests that he has a particular speech of Isocrates in mind, those in which he advises not an individual, like Nicocles, nor merely the Athenians, but all the Greeks as a whole. The words he addresses to Philip seem to the point (5.81–2):

I was born with the least natural gift of all citizens for doing politics—for I did not have a sufficient *voice* or boldness capable to deal with a crowd [ὄχλῳ], to take abuse, and to bandy words with the men who haunt the rostrum. . . . [82] But I do lay claim to sound judgement and good education, and I would count myself in comparison with others not among the last but among the foremost. And that is why I endeavor in this way, for which my nature and powers are suited, to give advice [συμβουλεύειν] to Athens and to the Hellenes at large and to the most distinguished among men.²²

In place of the great, shaggy mask, Isocrates is described by Hieronymus now as putting on the πλάσμα and κατασκευή of a *dêmêgoros*.²³ Isocrates does not in fact use the noun *dêmêgoros* in his

²² Cf. 12.2. Isocrates dwells on his disabilities repeatedly; cf. *Ep.* 1.9, 8.7, 12.9–10.

²³ The term πλάσμα may be Philodemus'. At 164–5 Sudhaus, Philodemus distinguishes it from τρόπος and σχῆμα.

extant writings, and Hieronymus must have known this. Again he almost seems to want to draw attention to Isocrates' lack of commitment to the Athenian democracy.

It seems quite clear that the ἀναγνώστης παῖς of Hieronymus' text is not a child but a slave, like those mentioned by Nepos in his *Life of Atticus*: *erant pueri litteratissimi, anagnostae optimi et plurimi librarii* (13.3). When Hieronymus wants to mention a child, he uses the term παῖδιον, as he does just a couple lines before. At any rate, the point has special force if seen in the context of Isocrates' claim to be an advisor to the Greeks. If he adopts the voice of a slave, that clearly has implications for his status. He cannot claim to be an advisor; he becomes rather a lackey, the slave who reads things aloud for his master (perhaps Philip?). The passage concludes by summing up: Isocrates' slave reader can sustain neither intensity, nor emotion, nor delivery.

Hieronymus' influence on Dionysius seems clearest in passages like the following:

I did not, however, approve of the circularity of [Isocrates'] forming of the periods and his juvenile use of figures of style, for the thought often becomes slave [δουλεύει] to the rhythm of the style, and realism is sacrificed to nicety. The most effective [κράτιστον] characteristic in political [ἐν διαλέκτῳ πολιτικῇ] and contentious discourse is similarity to what is natural. Nature wants the style to follow the thoughts. I don't know what help niceties and theatricalities and juvenile tricks could be to an advisor [συμβούλῳ] speaking about war and peace, or to a private man on trial for his life in the courts, but rather I know that they would cause harm. [*Isoc.* 12]

Bill Fortenbaugh has pointed out "that orators use delivery to arouse and calm their audience, but they do so while (and largely because) they are conveying an impression of themselves: they are calm or angry, deeply moved or unmoved."²⁴ Aristotle himself says that there are two forms of delivery, ethical and "pathetic" (*Rhet.* 1413b10–11), but he does not elaborate, except to say that some actors seek out certain plays because of the range of emotions they might be able to express in them. However, Aristotle must make many of his comments about delivery in rhetoric with the issues of delivery in tragedy in mind. He disparages delivery partly because he has little interest in the gestures of the actors, which are nonverbal. But Aristotle assumes that a reading of a tragedy, which for him conveys its function just as well as an actual perfor-

²⁴ Fortenbaugh (1985) 278.

mance, is done orally, out loud (see *Po.* 1453b4–6, 1462a11–18).²⁵ Theophrastus (293 FHS&G) agrees that hearing is the most emotional of the senses,²⁶ but his view of delivery is that it also involves gestures (712 FHS&G).

Within a very short passage, Hieronymus appears to have touched on a number of issues surrounding Isocrates' style, not only its being unsuitable for delivery, but how it reveals Isocrates' pedagogy, political role, and claims about his own status. Dionysius appears to have adopted several of Hieronymus' points in his assessment of Isocrates. Perhaps Philodemus has also.

Works Cited

- Berthold, R. M. 1984. *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age* (Ithaca: Cornell University).
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. 1985. "Theophrastus on Delivery," in *Theophrastus of Eresus: On his Life and Work* = *RUSCH* 2, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh, P. Huby, and A. A. Long (New Brunswick: Transaction), 269–88.
- Gabrielsen, V. 1997. *The Naval Aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes* (Aarhus: Aarhus University).
- Graff, R. 2001. "Reading and the 'Written Style' in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 31: 19–44.
- Hudson-Williams, H. L. 1949. "Isocrates and Recitations," *Classical Quarterly* 43: 65–9.
- Janko, R. 1995. "Reconstructing Philodemus' *On Poems*," in *Philodemus and Poetry*, ed. D. Obbink (Oxford: Oxford University), 69–96.
- Mariss, R. 2002. *Alkidamas: "Über diejenigen, die schriftliche Reden Schreiber, oder Über die Sophisten." Eine Sophistenrede aus dem 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. eingeleitet und kommentiert* (Münster: Aschendorff).
- Mirhady, D. and Y. L. Too. 2000. *Isocrates 1 = The Oratory of Classical Greece*, vol. 4.1 (Austin: University of Texas).

²⁵ In *Poetics* 1456b8–10, Aristotle assigns the various forms of speech (τὰ σχήματα τῆς λέξεως), such as commands vs. prayers etc., to delivery.

²⁶ Cf. Fortenbaugh (1985) 272 on the possibility that Cicero, in *Or.* 55, 60 and *De or.* 3.223–4, follows Theophrastus in emphasizing the importance of voice in delivery.

- O'Neil, J. 1981. "How Democratic was Hellenistic Rhodes?," *Athenaeum* 59: 468–73.
- Too, Y. L. 1995. *The Rhetoric of Identity in Isocrates: Text, Power, Pedagogy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University).
- Wehrli, F. 1969. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 10: *Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler* (Basel: Schwabe).

12

Hieronimus ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἀσπίδος Ἑσιόδου

Andrea Martano

1. Introduzione

Sulle tracce di Ieronimo di Rodi sembra possibile gettare qualche nuova luce sugli albori della filologia. In particolare, in queste pagine, cercheremo di indagare come e dove si sia sviluppata una delle prime fasi degli studi sui testi esiodei, quali fossero i modi ed i mezzi dei pionieri della critica letteraria come anche oggi la intendiamo, in quale modo dovette configurarsi in quest'ambito la rete di contatti e di filiazione intellettuale fra i peripatetici di seconda e terza generazione, e, per ultimo, quanto la filologia alessandrina possa essere debitrice nei riguardi di questi filosofi.¹

La necessità di una indagine che sondi questo settore della *Urphilologie* nasce dalla nostra recente edizione degli scolii allo *Scudo di Eracle* attribuito ad Esiodo, conservati nel Ms. Ambr. C 222 inf. del XII

¹ Rimando, per una ricostruzione nuova rispetto a Pfeiffer (1968) del quadro dei rapporti fra il peripato e la filologia alessandrina, a Montanari (2000), dove l'autore riprende in considerazione alcuni interventi di Demetrio del Falero in materia di critica letteraria su Omero.

sec. e nei due apografi diretti di questo, i mss. Parigini Gr. 1310 e Gr. 2678 del XV sec.² Questi scolii sono, per così dire, “abbracciati” dal testo della già nota ipotesi A, diviso, come avviene in molti mss. dello *Scudo*, in due parti, a principio ed a conclusione del testo poetico.³ Che il ms. Ambrosiano fosse un codice di notevolissima importanza era già noto per la tradizione di autori come Eschilo, Aristofane, Pindaro e Teocrito;⁴ gli scolii allo *Scudo di Eracle* in esso contenuti non fanno che dimostrare tale affermazione. Essi infatti presentano caratteristiche uniche rispetto alla restante tradizione di scolii allo *Scudo*.⁵ Le caratteristiche di questa raccolta sono tali da rendere lecito il sospetto che non si tratti di materiale di epoca bizantina, ma della risultante di commenti al piccolo epos composti in epoca antica e più volte modificati e ridotti fino al secolo XII.⁶

Già l'ipotesi A contiene riferimenti espliciti a due γραμματικοί che in qualche modo intervennero al dibattito sull'autenticità del poemetto: Megacle, all'unanimità emendato in Megaclide,⁷ peripatetico per altre vie noto per essersi occupato di Omero ed Esiodo, e Apollonio Rodio.⁸ A questi si aggiunge il nome di Aristofane di Bisanzio.⁹ A nostro avviso, come cercheremo di dimostrare, gli scolii e le glosse contenuti nel ms. Ambrosiano C 222 inf. danno un utile aiuto per chiarire il processo evolutivo dei metodi di esegesi condotta sul testo dello *Scudo*.

2. Scolio al v. 430–31 ed *Et. Gud.* 91.17 De Stef.: Epafrodito e Ieronimo di Rodi

Scolio al v. 430–31:

[π λ ε υ ρ ά ς τ ε κ α ῖ ὤ μ ο υ ς / ο ὐ ρ ῆ μ α σ τ ι ό ν] : λέγουσι τὸν λέοντα κέντρον ἔχειν ἐν τῇ οὐρᾷ. ὅταν δὲ μέλλῃ κατὰ τινος ἀγριωθῆναι,

² Martano (2002).

³ Rzach (1902) 267. Per la tradizione manoscritta dell'ipotesi A si veda l'apparato della suddetta edizione.

⁴ Martini-Bassi (1906) 984–90.

⁵ Schultz (1910) 13; Martano (2002) 164–5.

⁶ Martano (2002) 165–6.

⁷ Bux (1931) 124, *FHG* 4.443–4 Megacles (Megaclides). Si noti il lungo fr. estratto da Ath. 12 512A, che indica un parere di Megaclide proprio su questioni connesse alle vicende di Eracle: Schwartz (1960) 459–60.

⁸ Cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 141.

⁹ Arist. Byz. fr. 406 Slater: nel suo commento Slater suggerisce che la nota sull'autenticità dello *Scudo* provenga da un commento o da una ἀναγραφή.

μαστιρίζει δι' ἐκείνου τὰς πλευρὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ὦμους καὶ οὕτως ἀγριούται.¹⁰

430–31 ~ Sch. Paraphr. ad v. 424 . . . καὶ τὰς πλευρὰς καὶ τοὺς ἐκείνου τοῦ σώματος ὦμους τῇ οὐρᾷ μαστίζων . . .

430–31 ~ *Et. Gud.* 91.17 De Stef. ἀλκαία· ἡ οὐρά· κυρίως ἡ τοῦ λέοντος διὰ τὸ εἰς ἀλκὴν αὐτὸν τρέπειν. ἔχει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῇ οὐρᾷ κέντρον, ὅφ' οὐ παροξύνεται, καθά φησιν Ἱερώνυμος (fr. **45** White) καὶ Ἐπαφρόδιτος (fr. 52 Luenzner) ἐν Ὑπομνήματι Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου. ~ *Sch. Ap Rhod.* 4.1613b κήτεος ἀλκαίῃ· ἡ οὐρά. κυρίως ἀλκαία λέγεται ἡ τοῦ λέοντος οὐρά, ἀπὸ τοῦ δι' αὐτῆς εἰς ἀλκὴν αὐτὸν τρέπεσθαι . . . ~ *Sch. Il.* 20.170–1 οὐρῇ — μαστίεται· ἔχει γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτῇ κέντρον μέλαν ὡς κεράτιον δι' οὗ ἑαυτὸν μαστίζει. Nec non similiter Eust. 1201.63 et *Sch. Nic. Ther.* 123a ~ Ael. NA 6.1 τὰ δὲ ζῶα οὐ δεῖται τῆς ἔξωθεν ἐπιρρώσεως, ἑαυτοῖς δὲ παροξύνει τὴν ἀλκὴν, καὶ ἑαυτὰ ἀνίστησι καὶ ἐγείρει. ὁ γοῦν σὺς μέλλων ἐς μάχην ἰέναι πρὸς ταῖς λείαις πέτραις τοὺς ὀδόντας ὑποθήγει. τοῦτό τοι καὶ Ὀμηρος τῷ ζῶφ μαρτυρῶν δῆλός ἐστι. καὶ μέντοι καὶ ὁ λέων τῇ ἀλκαίᾳ ἑαυτὸν ἐπεγείρει μαστίζων, καὶ βλακεύειν καὶ ἐλινύειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπει (= Aristoph. Byz. Ep. 2.157).

Questo scolio altro non è che un aderente commento ai versi riportati nel lemma e non possiede alcun corrispettivo stringente nella restante tradizione, per la gran parte già edita, di scolii al poemetto esiodico.¹¹

Numerosi invece i luoghi paralleli rintracciabili altrove. Fra quelli che si possono leggere nella seconda fascia dell'apparato, mi sembra che il più rilevante ai fini di questa indagine sia estratto dall'*Etymologicon Gudianum*: la medesima descrizione della coda del leone che abbiamo letto nello scolio ambrosiano al v. 430-31, riportata in margine al lemma ἀλκαία dell'*Etymologicon*, è riferita ad un commentario di Epafrodito allo *Scudo di Eracle*,¹² in cui era citato Ieronimo di Rodi.¹³

¹⁰ Traduzione: “i fianchi e il dorso si flagella con la coda: dicono che il leone abbia un pungolo nella coda. Qualora abbia intenzione di far violenza contro qualcuno, sferza mediante quello i suoi fianchi e le sue spalle, e così fa violenza.”

¹¹ Gaisford (1823), Ranke (1840). Si noterà che quanto estratto dall'edizione del Gaisford e riportato nella prima fascia di apparato manca completamente della sezione più importante della nota, ovvero della spiegazione sulla costituzione della coda del leone.

¹² Erudito del I sec. d. C. che si occupò di Omero, Esiodo e Callimaco: Luenzner (1868), Martano (2002) 161. Che Epafrodito non fosse stato il primo a commentare lo *Scudo* già si accorse lo Jacoby (vedi Schwartz [1960] 459 n. 2).

¹³ Secondo il riconosciuto e consueto modo di citare dell'*Etymologicon*, per cui il primo nome che si incontra è quello dell'*auctoritas* citata nell'opera del secondo.

Ne presentiamo, per correttezza filologica, l'edizione di De Stefani e poi quella di Sturz, che è riprodotta nell'edizione dei frammenti di Ieronimo del Wehrli e nella presente edizione di White.¹⁴

1) *Et. Gud.* 91.17 De Stef.

ἀλκαία· ἡ οὐρά· κυρίως ἡ τοῦ λέοντος διὰ τὸ εἰς ἀλκὴν αὐτὸν τρέπειν. ἔχει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῇ οὐρᾷ κέντρον, ὑφ' οὗ παροξύνεται, κ[αθά φησιν] Ἱερώνυμος <fr. 20 Hiller> καὶ Ἑπαφ[ρόδιτος] <fr. 52 Luenzner> ἐν Ὑπομνήματι Ἀσπίδος [Ἡσιόδου].¹⁵

2) Ieronymo fr. 45 White = 36.13 Sturz

ἀλκαία· ἡ οὐρά· κυρίως ἡ τοῦ λέοντος, διὰ τὸ εἰς ἀλκὴν αὐτὸν τρέπειν· ἔχει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῇ οὐρᾷ κέντρον, ἄφ' οὗ παροξύνεται, καθὼς φησιν Ἱερώνυμος καὶ Ἑπαφρόδιτος ἐν ὑπομνήσει Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου.

Di seguito presento, a causa delle piccole discrepanze che le due edizioni mostrano, quanto io proporrei per l'edizione della voce dell'*Etymologicon* in questione, in base a quanto si legge nel ms. Vat. Barb. Gr. 70, archetipo riconosciuto della sua tradizione.¹⁶

ἀλκαία· ἡ οὐρά. κυρίως ἡ τοῦ λέοντος· διὰ τὸ εἰς ἀλκὴν τρέπειν. (D) ἔχει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῇ οὐρᾷ κέντρ[ον] ὑφ' οὗ παροξύνεται, κα[θὼς] Ἱερώνυμος καὶ Ἑπαφ[ρόδιτος] ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἀσπίδ[ος] (D2)¹⁷

¹⁴ De Stefani (1909) 91, Sturz (1818) 36, Wehrli (1969b) 16.

¹⁵ Traduzione: "ἀλκαία: coda. Propriamente quella del leone, per il fatto che lo spinge alla lotta [ἀλκή]. Infatti ha sulla coda un pungolo dal quale è incitato, come dice Ieronimo ed Epafrodito nel commentario allo *Scudo* di Esiodo."

¹⁶ Maleci (1995) 5.

¹⁷ Ne fornisco anche la trascrizione diplomatica del folium 13r linea 24 linea 19 D: ἀλκ(αί)α ἡ (οὐ)ρά. κυρί(ως) ἡ τ(οῦ) λέοντ<ος>· δι(α) τὸ εἰς ἀλκ(ήν) αὐτ(ὸν) τρέπ(ειν). (D)17 in dextro margine, post lemma quod supra scripsimus:

ἔχει (γὰρ) ἐπὶ τῇ οὐρᾷ κέντρ[ον]
 ὑφ' οὗ παροξύνε(α)ι κα[θὼς]
 ἱερώνυμ(ος) (καὶ) ἐπαφ[ρόδιτος]
 ἐν ὑπομνή(μα)τι ἀσπίδ[ος] (D2)17

Signa critica

() compendiorum solutio

[] evanida

< > verba decurtata integre reddita

(D) manus scribae principalis

(D2) manus alterius scribae qui in marginibus alias notulas addidit.

Appare evidente dalla trascrizione diplomatica che:

1. ὑπομνή è abbreviato per troncamento; sono di conseguenza giustificabili sia la

3 solum καθὼς fortasse D2 : καθὼς φασὶν O; καθὼς φησιν W; καθά φησιν C.
 1 solum ἀσπίδος fortasse D2 : ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου C O W

Ritorniamo allora al tema centrale. Si è fatto riferimento ad un commentario completo allo Scudo redatto nel I sec. d. C. dal grammatico Epafrodito, fonte esplicita dell'Etymologicum Gudianum. Ma in che rapporto sono il nome di Ieronimo e quello di Epafrodito? Credo si possa escludere, come ho già mostrato sopra, che si tratti di due citazioni indipendenti da due opere distinte dei due studiosi, ovvero una non meglio identificata di Ieronimo ed il commentario allo *Scudo* di Epafrodito. E' perspicuo il fatto che chi citava, lo facesse da un commento allo *Scudo* esiodeo che passava sotto il nome di Epafrodito, e che Epafrodito a sua volta, almeno con certezza in questo caso, avesse come fonte Ieronimo di Rodi.¹⁸

Ma, se è lecito chiederselo e fare delle supposizioni, da che opera di Ieronimo Epafrodito poteva trarre questa citazione? Luenzner pensava che Epafrodito estraesse la citazione dagli Ἱστορικά ὑπομνήματα o dagli Σποράδην ὑπομνήματα di Ieronimo, in polemica con Mützell, il quale credeva che sia Ieronimo che Epafrodito avessero commentato lo *Scudo*.¹⁹ Wehrli suggeriva invece che Epafrodito citasse Ieronimo “di

lettura ὑπομνήσει di Sturz che quella ὑπομνήματι di De Stefani, sebbene già Luenzner (1852) 45, come noi—seguendo De Stefani—facciamo, preferiva la lettura ὑπομνήματι.

2. ὑφ' è di lettura chiarissima e non da adito a fraintendimenti.

3. il κα[θὼς] sembra preferibile al καθά sia su base paleografica (per quanto la lettura sia resa difficile dall'abrasione della pergamena) sia per la maggior ricorrenza negli apografi.

4. il φησιν non sembra avere lo spazio per essere presente a testo nel ms. Vat. Barb. Gr. 70, soprattutto perchè bisognerebbe supporre una scrittura abbreviata sia per il κα[θὼς], che nelle altre ricorrenze nel ms. è in forma completa, che per il φησιν, cosa probabile per coerenza interna del manoscritto, ma, come detto sopra, non contenibile nello spazio fra il καθὼς ed il margine del ms.

5. dell' Ἡσιόδου nessuna traccia visibile nel manoscritto Vat. Barb. 70.

¹⁸ Ci sembra opportuno delimitare il testo della citazione ieronimiana alle parole ἔχει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῇ οὐρᾷ κέντρον, ὑφ' οὗ παρξύνεται sia sulla base delle modalità di copiatura nel ms. Vat. Barber. Gr. 70 (si veda la n. 17), sia per motivi interni al testo del lemma stesso (la parola ἀλκαία sembra essere usata per la prima volta da Callimaco fr. 177.23 Pfeiffer, e avrebbe potuto essere presente quindi nel commento di Epafrodito, che si occupò anche di Callimaco, ma non nel testo di Ieronimo), sia infine perchè solo questa parte ricorre negli scolii ambrosiani allo *Scudo*, ed è l'unica parte necessaria alla spiegazione del testo poetico. Vedi anche Luenzner (1868) 45.

¹⁹ Luenzner (1868) 16.

seconda mano” da un commentario ad Omero.²⁰ E, sebbene questa proposta non appaia affatto inconcepibile, tuttavia tenderemo di tracciare un'altra via.

Procederemo a questo punto per esclusione. Il grammatico di età neroniana non citò Ieronimo estraendo il passo da un'opera *Περὶ ζώων*. Possiamo affermarlo con una certa sicurezza constatando la totale assenza di un titolo o di contenuti zoologici nei frammenti di Ieronimo. Si consideri, in secondo luogo, il fr. 125 Wehrli di Eudemo:

Legat [sc. Aemilianus] veterum philosophorum monumenta, tandem ut intellegat non me primum haec requisisse, sed iam pridem maiores meos, Aristotelen dico et Theop<h>rastum et Eudemum et Lyconem ceterosque Platonis minores, qui plurimos libros de genitu animalium deque victu deque pariculis deque omni differentia reliquerunt. [Apul. *Apologia* 36; Lyco **15** SFOD]

Sono citati Aristotele, Teofrasto, Eudemo e Licone, ma non si fa il nome di Ieronimo di Rodi in relazione ad opere di contenuto zoologico.

Si aggiunga infine quanto si può osservare in margine al testo di Claudio Eliano, *NA* 6.1, che riporta una notizia simile a quella contenuta nello scolio ambrosiano allo *Scudo* 430–31:

Δέονται μὲν ἄνθρωποι λόγου τοῦ προτρέψοντος καὶ ἀναπείσοντος ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι καὶ τὴν μὲν δειλίαν διώξοντος, τὸ δὲ εὐθαρσὲς παρασκευάσοντος, ἀθληταὶ μὲν ἐς τὰ στάδια, στρατιῶται δὲ ἐς τὰ ὅπλα· τὰ δὲ ζῶα οὐ δεῖται τῆς ἔξωθεν ἐπιρρώσεως, ἑαυτοῖς δὲ παροξύνει τὴν ἀλκὴν, καὶ ἑαυτὰ ἀνίστησι καὶ ἐγείρει. ὁ γοῦν σὺς μέλλων ἐς μάχην ἰέναι πρὸς ταῖς λείαις πέτραις τοὺς ὀδόντας ὑποθήγει. τοῦτό τοι καὶ Ὅμηρος τῷ ζῶῳ μαρτυρῶν δῆλός ἐστι. καὶ μέντοι καὶ ὁ λέων τῇ ἀλκαίᾳ ἑαυτὸν ἐπεγείρει μαστίζων, καὶ βλακεύειν καὶ ἐλινύειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπει. καὶ τοῦτο δὲ ὁ ποιητὴς εἰδὼς ἄδει περὶ τοῦ λέοντος.²¹

²⁰ Wehrli (1969b) 37 fa notare come una analoga spiegazione ricorra nello scolio ad *Iliade* 20.170 e così conclude: “Für das h.-Zitat ist an einen Honerkommentar zu denken. Wer die Glosse im Hinblick auf die Ilias- oder Scutumstelle erklärt hat, läßt sich nicht sagen.” Per questo motivo, all'interno degli scritti *Περὶ ποιητῶν* di Ieronimo (**41** White, in almeno 5 libri), Wehrli supposeva che fosse presente, insieme al *Περὶ τραγωδοποιῶν* (**42A** White) e al *Περὶ κιθαρωδῶν* (**41** White), un *Περὶ Ὁμήρου*. Ma mi sembra che la concisione dello scolio ad 20.170 non suggerisca tanto il percorso Commentario all'*Iliade* → Commentario allo *Scudo*, quanto viceversa Commentario allo *Scudo* → Commentario all'*Iliade*.

²¹ Scholfield (1959).

Per quanto il passo di Eliano possa essere solo a fatica definito “luogo parallelo” del fr. di Ieronimo di Rodi,²² tuttavia è lecito chiedersi se il filosofo di Rodi potesse essere stato la fonte di Eliano. Da più di cento anni si dibatte sulle fonti dello zoologo romano,²³ senza che ancora si possa dire concluso questo settore di indagine. Certamente Eliano utilizzò tutte le opere di Aristotele in materia di zoologia, fra le quali anche testi aristotelici perduti “quae fortasse retractaverant peripatetici,”²⁴ attraverso la ben nota epitome di Aristofane Bizantino.²⁵ In Eliano e nell’Epitome sono infatti presenti, oltre ad Aristotele, anche i nomi di Teofrasto e di Eudemo.²⁶ Mai quello di Ieronimo di Rodi, che evidentemente non scrisse un’opera di zoologia.

Tuttavia il fatto che nel testo di Eliano si ponga un paragone fra il modo di adirarsi umano e quello animale, sembrerebbe proporre una seconda possibilità: il grammatico avrebbe potuto citare da un *De Ira* di Ieronimo, opera di cui si possiede più di un frammento.²⁷ E tuttavia, ancora una volta, l’assenza del nome di Ieronimo in Eliano, nonché l’assenza delle parole che crediamo essere propriamente del nostro, può con un buon margine di certezza farci scartare anche questa seconda ipotesi. Sembra dunque più credibile supporre, vista la maggior estensione dello scolio ambrosiano rispetto allo scolio all’*Iliade* 20.170, che Ieronimo desse una spiegazione dettagliata *ad locum*, ovvero che esplicitamente commentasse questi versi esiodei, probabilmente giovandosi di un’opera di zoologia di altri peripatetici (Aristotele, Teofrasto o Eudemo, che alcuni anni prima di Ieronimo aveva cercato esilio proprio a Rodi).

3. Scolio al v. 301 ed *Et. Gud.* 177.23 De Stef.: Epafrodito, <Ieronimo>, e la trattatistica Περὶ μέθης

Scolio al v. 301:

ἔ τ ρ α π ο υ : ἔθλιβον τοὺς βότρυας καὶ κατεπάτων²⁸

²² La citazione di Ieronimo dovette infatti essere semplicemente riferita al κέντρον che il leone ha nella coda e non al nome della coda stessa (cf. n. 17), e non è presente nel testo di Eliano.

²³ Wellmann (1891a), (1891b), (1895), (1896), (1916), Keydell (1937).

²⁴ Slater (1986) 141–2, De Stefani (1904), Pfeiffer (1968) 173 e 209.

²⁵ Scholfield (1959) xv.

²⁶ Cf. fr. 126–32 Wehrli.

²⁷ 25–7 White.

²⁸ Traduzione: “schiacciavano i grappoli e li calpestavano.”

~ *Et. Gud.* 177.21 De Stef. ἀπότροπος οἶνος· τραπεῖν γάρ ἐστι τὸ πατῆσαι, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πατηθῆναι γινόμενον ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς ἀπότροπος οἶνος λέγεται. οὕτω Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἐν Ὑπομνήματι Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου (fr. 51 Luenzner). ~ *Et. Mag.* 763.52 Τραπεέουσι: Δηλοῖ τὸ πατροῦσι· παρὰ τὸ τρέφω, τὸ πῆσσω, ἐκ τοῦ θρέψαι. nec non 162.24 Ἀτραπός: Ὁ οἶνος· τραπεῖν [γάρ] ἐστι τὸ πατῆσαι· ὅθεν καὶ τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πατηθῆναι γινόμενον ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς ἀγραπὸς οἶνος καὶ ἀπότροπος λέγεται. Οὕτως Ὡρος. ~ *Ap. S.* 154.11 τράπεον· ἐπάτουv.

Ancora una volta una parafrasi che resterebbe priva di qualunque interesse se non intervenisse un lemma dell' *Etymologicon Gudianum*:²⁹

ἀπότροπος οἶνος· τραπεῖν γάρ ἐστι τὸ πατῆσαι, ὅθεν καὶ τὸ πρὸ τοῦ πατηθῆναι γινόμενον ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς ἀπότροπος οἶνος λέγεται. οὕτω Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἐν Ὑπομνήματι Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου <fr. 51 Luenzner>. [*Et. Gud.* 177.23 De Stef.]

La coppia sinonimica τραπεῖν = πατῆσαι (che si riscontra in veste ridottissima sia nello scolio ambrosiano al v. 301 che negli scolii allo stesso verso editi dal Ranke),³⁰ risalirebbe al commentario allo *Scudo di Eracle* del grammatico Epafrodito, il quale avrebbe, di seguito alla glossa sul verbo, dato una spiegazione dell'inconsueta forma ἀπότροπος οἶνος, assente dal testo esiodeo.

Questa spiegazione, distante, come abbiamo appena notato, da quanto richiedeva la parafrasi stretta del luogo esiodeo, sembrerebbe risalire non tanto al grammatico Epafrodito o, per lo meno, non solamente a lui: la trattatistica specializzata sul vino è un ambito in cui i peripatetici furono maestri. Già Aristotele³¹ e Teofrasto³² composero libri Περὶ μέθης, e lo stesso fecero in seguito Camaleonte³³ e Ieronimo di Rodi.³⁴ Ed il fr. 29 White contiene un paraetimologia non dissimile, per intento, dalla nostra. Se la notizia dello scolio ambrosiano al v. 301 risale, anche lontanamente, alla trattatistica peripatetica sul vino e l'ubriachezza, e fu contenuta in un commento che per altra via rimanda al nome di Ieronimo di Rodi, sorge il sospetto che Epafrodito potesse

²⁹ Martano (2002) 161.

³⁰ Ranke (1840) 36: ἐ τ ρ ἄ π ε ο ν · ἐπάτουv

³¹ Fr. 103–11 Rose.

³² Fr. 569–79B FHS&G.

³³ Fr. 9–13 e Wehrli (1969a) 73.

³⁴ 28–9 White.

disporre di uno scritto di Ieronimo che si occupasse in maniera più ampia di questioni connesse con l'esegesi allo *Scudo di Eracle*.

4. L'ipotesi allo *Scudo* e la critica letteraria peripatetica: gli esempi di Dicearco e <Ieronimo di Rodi>

Ancora un'ultima occasione per riflettere sull'origine del materiale esegetico pertinente allo *Scudo di Eracle* ci viene offerta dal frammento di ipotesi contenuto nel manoscritto Ambrosiano:

[hyp.]: τοῦτο τὸ ποίημα τινὲς ἀθετοῦσιν οὐχὶ τοῦ 'Ησιόδου εἶναι λέγοντες ἀλλὰ Κρεσφόντου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ὡς τὴν ὁμηρικὴν ἀσπίδα μιμήσασθαι αἰρουμένου.

hyp. ~ Hypoth. A ad *Scutum* διὸ καὶ ὑπώπτευκεν 'Αριστοφάνης ὡς οὐκ οὔσαν αὐτὴν 'Ησιόδου, ἀλλ' ἑτέρου τινὸς τὴν ὁμηρικὴν ἀσπίδα μιμήσασθαι προαιρουμένου.

hyp. ~ *Sch. vet. Hes. Op.* 271a μήτ' ἐμὸς υἱός] ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι υἱὸς 'Ησιόδου Μνασέας ἐστί. Φιλόχορος (*FGrH* 328 fr. 213) δὲ Στησίχορον φησι τὸν ἀπὸ Κλυμένης· ἄλλοι δὲ 'Αρχιέπην. Nec non 271b μήτ' ἐμὸς υἱός] υἱὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ Μνασέας ἢ 'Αρχιέπης. Φιλόχορος δὲ Στησίχορον. ~ Tzetzes in *Hes. Op. prolegomena* (2.7.33–8, 1–4 Gaisford) 'Αριστοτέλης γὰρ ὁ φιλόσοφος, μᾶλλον δ' οἶμαι ὁ τοῦς Πέπλους συντάξας, ἐν τῇ 'Ορχομενίων πολιτείᾳ Στησίχορον τὸν μελοποιὸν εἶναί φησι υἱὸν 'Ησιόδου ἐκ τῆς Κλυμένης αὐτῷ γεννηθέντα τῆς 'Αμφιφάνους καὶ Γανύκτορος ἀδελφῆς, θυγατρὸς δὲ Φηγέως.³⁵

Il testo appena citato mostra delle evidenti somiglianze sintattiche (ἀλλὰ Κρεσφόντου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ὡς τὴν ὁμηρικὴν ἀσπίδα μιμήσασθαι αἰρουμένου / ἀλλ' ἑτέρου τινὸς τὴν ὁμηρικὴν ἀσπίδα μιμήσασθαι προαιρουμένου) con una sezione dell'ipotesi A allo *Scudo di Eracle*, ed in ogni caso ne possiede lo stesso intento: discutere delle opinioni riguardanti l'autenticità del poemetto esiodeo. Si consideri il testo dell'ipotesi A:

Τῆς ἀσπίδος ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ Καταλόγῳ φέρεται μέχρι στίχων ν' καὶ ζ'. διὸ καὶ ὑπώπτευκεν 'Αριστοφάνης ὡς οὐκ οὔσαν αὐτὴν 'Ησιόδου, ἀλλ' ἑτέρου τινὸς τὴν ὁμηρικὴν ἀσπίδα μιμήσασθαι προαιρουμένου. Μεγα-

³⁵ Martano (2002) 169 e 165. Traduzione: "Alcuni ritengono spurio questo poema dicendo che non è di Esiodo ma di suo figlio Cresfonte, come se provasse ad imitare lo Scudo di Omero."

κλείδης ὁ Ἀθηναῖος γνήσιον μὲν οἶδε τὸ ποίημα, ἄλλως ἐπιτιμᾷ τῷ
 Ἑσιόδῳ· ἄλογον γάρ φησι ποιεῖν ὅπλα Ἥφαιστον τοῖς τῆς μητρὸς ἐχθροῖς.
 Ἀπολλώνιος δὲ ὁ Ῥόδιος ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ φησὶν αὐτοῦ εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος
 καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πάλιν τὸν Ἰόλαον ἐν τῷ Καταλόγῳ εὐρίσκειν ἡνιοχοῦντα
 Ἡρακλεῖ. καὶ Στησίχορος δέ φησιν Ἑσιόδου εἶναι τὸ ποίημα.³⁶

Il fr. di ipotesi ambrosiana, a nostro avviso, appartiene ad una fase della tradizione dell'ipotesi allo *Scudo* antecedente a quella che fino ad oggi abbiamo letto. Ovvero, prima di presentarsi nella *facies* che noi oggi conosciamo, probabilmente quella che noi chiamiamo ipotesi A dovette contenere anche le informazioni che si trovano nel fr. di ipotesi ambrosiano. Che non si tratti infatti di una tarda e tutta fantasiosa invenzione bizantina appare chiaro per la presenza del nome di Cresfonte, altrimenti ignoto alla tradizione dei figli di Esiodo³⁷ nonché all'ultimo collettore di questa tradizione: Giovanni Tzetzes.³⁸ D'altra parte la già ricordata somiglianza sintattica con una sezione dell'ipotesi A, nonché la ricorrenza dell'espressione τὸ ποίημα sembrano far risalire il fr. di ipotesi ambrosiano allo stesso contesto, appunto, dell'ipotesi A.³⁹ Ora, il testo della stessa ipotesi A viene accostato, ancora una volta per evidenti somiglianze, a quello della terza ipotesi al *Reso* euripideo,⁴⁰ sulla cui paternità dicearchea da tempo si discute. Il fr. di ipotesi ambrosiano ci spinge a farlo ancora una volta.

³⁶ Traduzione: "L'inizio dello *Scudo* fino al verso 56 si tramanda nel quarto libro del *Catalogo*. Perciò Aristofane di Bisanzio sospettò che non fosse di Esiodo ma di qualcun altro che tentava di imitare lo Scudo omerico. Megaclide di Atene lo conosce come autentico, ma rimprovera Esiodo: dice infatti che non ha senso che Efesto fabbrichi le armi per i nemici della madre. Apollonio Rodio nel terzo libro dice che è suo (sc. di Esiodo) in base al carattere ed al fatto che nel *Catalogo* si trova un'altra volta Iolao che guida il carro per Eracle. Anche Stesicoro dice che il poema è di Esiodo."

³⁷ Cf. apparato e Buzio (1938) 61.

³⁸ Cf. Io. Tzetzæ Vita Hesiodi, ed. F. Solmsen: essa fornisce un utile *argumentum ex silentio*.

³⁹ Non credo che si possa pensare ad una influenza di costrutti dell'ipotesi A sulla composizione del fr. ambrosiano: nel ms. ambrosiano infatti solo la prima parte dell'ipotesi A deriva dall'antigrafo che conteneva anche il testo, mentre gli scholia ed il fr. di ipotesi, provengono da un antigrafo differente: Martano (2002) 154–5.

⁴⁰ Russo (1965) 67 ed, ivi citato, Raddatz (1916) 422.

Τοῦτο τὸ δράμα ἔνιοι νόθον ὑπενόησαν ὡς οὐκ ὄν Εὐριπίδου· τὸν γὰρ Σοφοκλεῖον μᾶλλον ὑποφαίνει **χαρακτῆρα**. ἐν μέντοι ταῖς Διδασκαλίαις ὡς **γνήσιον** ἀναγράφεται. καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰ μετάρσια δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πολυπραγμοσύνη τὸν Εὐριπίδην ὁμολογεῖ. πρόλογοι δὲ διττοὶ φέρονται. ὁ γοῦν **Δικαίάρχος** ἐκτιθεὶς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τοῦ Ῥήσου γράφει κατὰ λέξιν οὕτως· “νῦν εὐσέληνον φέγγος ἡ διφρήλατος” καὶ ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἕτερός τις φέρεται πρόλογος, πεζὸς πάνυ καὶ οὐ πρέπων Εὐριπίδῃ· καὶ τάχα ἂν τινες τῶν ὑποκριτῶν διεσκευακότες εἶεν αὐτόν. ἔχει δὲ οὕτως· κτλ.

Τοῦτο τὸ ποίημα τινὲς ἀθετοῦσιν οὐχὶ τοῦ Ἡσιόδου εἶναι λέγοντες ἀλλὰ Κρесоφόντου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ὡς τὴν ὁμηρικὴν ἀσπίδα μιμήσασθαι αἰρουμένου.

Τῆς ἀσπίδος ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν τῷ τετάρτῳ Καταλόγῳ φέρεται μέχρι στίχων ν' καὶ ζ'. διὸ καὶ ὑπώπτευκεν Ἀριστοφάνης ὡς οὐκ οὐσαν αὐτὴν Ἡσιόδου, ἀλλ' ἐτέρου τινὸς τὴν ὁμηρικὴν ἀσπίδα μιμήσασθαι προαιρουμένου.

Μεγακλείδης ὁ Ἀθηναῖος **γνήσιον** μὲν οἶδε τὸ ποίημα, ἄλλως ἐπιτιμᾷ τῷ Ἡσιόδῳ· ἄλογον γὰρ φησι ποιεῖν ὅπλα Ἥφαιστον τοῖς τῆς μητρὸς ἐχθροῖς. Ἀπολλώνιος δὲ ὁ Ῥόδιος ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ φησὶν αὐτοῦ εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ **χαρακτῆρος** καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πάλιν τὸν Ἰόλαον ἐν τῷ Καταλόγῳ εὐρίσκειν ἥνιοχ-οῦντα Ἡρακλεῖ. καὶ Στησίχορος δὲ φησιν Ἡσιόδου εἶναι τὸ ποίημα.

Non riportiamo queste due in parallelo per un caso fortuito o per la semplice somiglianza, fine a se stessa. Crediamo infatti che, sulla base dei recenti sviluppi sull'argomento “ipotesi” (e più marcatamente “ipotesi di Dicearco a testi drammatici”), resti ancora qualcosa da dire. Sulla base infatti di Sesto Empirico, *Adv. Math.* 3.3:

πολλαχῶς μὲν καὶ ἄλλως ὑπόθεσις προσαγορεύεται, τὰ νῦν δὲ ἀπαρκέσει τριχῶς λέγεσθαι. καθ' ἓνα μὲν τρόπον ἡ δραματικὴ περιπέτεια, καθὼ καὶ τραγικὴν καὶ κωμικὴν ὑπόθεσιν εἶναι λέγομεν καὶ **Δικαίάρχου** τινὰς **ὑποθέσεις** τῶν Εὐριπίδου καὶ Σοφοκλέους μύθων, οὐκ ἄλλο τι καλοῦντες ὑπόθεσιν ἢ τὴν τοῦ δράματος περιπέτειαν.

Nauck corresse quanto riportato dai mss. nell'ipotesi del *Reso*, ovvero δικαίαν in Δικαίάρχος. Scrisse quindi Dicearco realmente delle ipotesi a drammi euripidei e sofoclei? E che tipo di informazioni potevano contenere siffatte ipotesi?

Esaminiamo innanzitutto l'affermazione di Sesto Empirico. Carrara,⁴¹ sulla base di Kassel,⁴² afferma che non c'è motivo per prestare fede a quanto dice Sesto Empirico sulle ipotesi di Dicearco, in quanto si tratterebbe di una aggiunta personale di Sesto rispetto alla sua fonte. Se anche così fosse, non avremmo altra considerazione da fare se non che Sesto potesse leggere delle ipotesi a drammi euripidei e sofoclei che non contenessero altro che la περιπέτεια (tale specificazione ci farebbe supporre che sotto il suo stesso nome ne circolassero alcune con informazioni più dettagliate e numerose). Né tantomeno si possono considerare cogenti le considerazioni di Rusten, il quale credeva che le ipotesi, contenenti solo il *plot* delle tragedie, avessero assunto la paternità di Dicearco solo nel II secolo d. C., allo stesso modo in cui la *Biblioteca* assunse la paternità di Apollodoro,⁴³ per "rivestirsi" di una certa autorità. La smentita, a mio avviso, proviene dai numerosi frammenti di Dicearco tratti da ipotesi tragiche:⁴⁴ questi per lo meno dimostrano l'interesse del peripatetico verso questioni più ampie delle semplici *fabulae*.

Mi avvicino dunque a quanto già sostenuto da Haslam⁴⁵ e, prima ancora, da Gallavotti⁴⁶ al momento della pubblicazione del papiro contenente tre ipotesi a drammi euripidei, per cui il nucleo delle ipotesi poteva essere realmente di Dicearco e potesse comprendere, oltre al contenuto dell'opera, anche notazioni critiche di vario genere. Se infatti esaminiamo il testo dell'ipotesi al *Reso* non possiamo che fare delle considerazioni che giovino al nostro assunto.

- 1) Non dubiteremmo della fondamentale unità del testo a noi giunto: se il δέ sembra un "legame troppo debole se dovesse connettere con quanto precede,"⁴⁷ questo potrebbe essere solo sintomo di una eventuale riduzione del testo così come a noi è pervenuto.
- 2) Quanto all' ὁ γούν credo che in nessun modo possa riferirsi al primo dei due prologhi di cui l'ipotesi parla poco prima (non avrebbe nessuna

⁴¹ Carrara (1992) 38.

⁴² Kassel (1985) 53–9.

⁴³ Rusten (1982).

⁴⁴ Ipotesi all'*Aiace* di Sofocle (fr. 113 Mirhady), ipotesi all'*Edipo Re* di Sofocle (fr. 101), ipotesi all'*Alceste* di Euripide (fr. 115A).

⁴⁵ Haslam (1975).

⁴⁶ Gallavotti (1933).

⁴⁷ Carrara (1992) 39.

coerenza con le parole che completano la frase).⁴⁸ Piuttosto sottintende un soggetto, o ne è privo per errore dei copisti. A questo punto o si intende, come suggerisce il Carrara, Euripide, che “narrando correttamente il contenuto (del prologo ?!?), scrive testualmente così: etc.,” o si cerca per altra via di comprendere chi possa essere celato fra le parole dell’ipotesi. E crediamo che per farlo sia necessario intervenire sul testo tradito. Se non vogliamo accettare la semplice e plausibile correzione del Nauck, e, come fa il Carrara, vogliamo salvare il δικάϊαν nel senso di “corretto, giusto”, possiamo tuttavia tentare un’altra via. Infatti, se si suppone non un fraintendimento (ΔΙΚΑΙΑΝ per ΔΙΚΑΙΑΡ),⁴⁹ ma una lacuna dovuta alla somiglianza delle due parole, magari abbreviate, si potrebbe diversamente integrare, recuperando anche una porzione di senso: ὁ γοῦν <Δικαίάρχος> δικάϊαν ἐκτιθείς κτλ. si intenderebbe quindi: “Dicearco, narrando correttamente il contenuto della tragedia, scrive testualmente etc.”

L’ipotesi riporterebbe in sintesi almeno alcuni elementi contenuti nell’ipotesi di Dicearco: una questione sull’autenticità ed il prologo originale, quello appunto testimoniato nella sua ipotesi e non quello presente in altri manoscritti.⁵⁰

Ritorniamo ancora una volta alle questioni originarie: la somiglianza tra le due ipotesi (quella allo *Scudo* e quella al *Reso*) e le possibili considerazioni che si possono trarre da questo accostamento. Alla già detta somiglianza tra l’ipotesi ambrosiana e l’ipotesi al *Reso*, sia di intento che di disposizione sintattica nonchè d’uso terminologico, è necessario aggiungere la ulteriore congruenza che si instaura grazie all’uso, in entrambi i testi, di γνήσιον e χαρακτήρ (termini usati con frequenza nella critica letteraria ad indicare l’autenticità e le caratteristiche stilistiche di un autore).⁵¹ Credo che sia innegabile l’evidenza del fatto che provengano entrambe da un alveo critico-letterario comune. E, sebbene per entrambe sia stato suggerito il nome di Aristofane di Bisanzio,⁵² tuttavia crediamo che si possa fare un passo indietro.

Ammettendo che l’ipotesi al *Reso* risalga, attraverso le necessarie e scontate modificazioni, a Dicearco, e che a lui stesso siano dovuti non

⁴⁸ Questa considerazione credo che nasca spontanea proprio dall’esame dei luoghi paralleli addotti dal Carrara (1992) 42

⁴⁹ Luppe (1990).

⁵⁰ Schwartz (1960) 461 n. 1.

⁵¹ Körte (1929), spec. 82.

⁵² Gudeman (1929) 668.

solo i versi del prologo originale, ma anche i dubbi sulla autenticità, allora si potrebbe supporre che una analoga costituzione sia alle spalle dell'ipotesi allo *Scudo* nel suo complesso (Hyp. A + Hyp. ambrosiana), e che l'equivalente peripatetico di Dicearco (nucleo dell'ipotesi al *Reso*) possa essere Ieronimo (nucleo dell'ipotesi allo *Scudo*).⁵³ All'esempio delle ipotesi, che ha infatti messo in evidenza i legami di metodo e interessi fra Dicearco e Ieronimo, si possono aggiungere altre testimonianze in cui i nomi dei due peripatetici si trovano associati in relazione ad analoghe questioni: interessi sulla tragedia (Dic. fr. 99–102, 112–15 Mirhady), interessi biografici (Dic. fr. 33–52, 71), nonché una tendenza alla razionalizzazione del mito (Dic. fr. 67). Non è improbabile che un contatto fra gli interessi dei due avvenisse ad Atene⁵⁴ e che i frutti fossero poi trasferiti dal più giovane Ieronimo a Rodi.⁵⁵

Per giunta la notizia per cui l'ipotesi ambrosiana attribuisce ad un Cresfonte⁵⁶ l'operetta pseudo-esiodea dovette essere contenuta nella versione del testo redatta da Epafrodito, ma non ebbe fortuna. Se dunque ammettiamo, come alla nota 53, che il *tivne* dell'ipotesi ambrosiana celi un giudizio o una notizia di Ieronimo di Rodi, allora anche la fantasiosa attribuzione a Cresfonte potrebbe risalire fino a lui. E potremmo richiamarci agli interessi di Ieronimo in materia di questioni poetiche (scrisse cinque libri sui poeti), alla sua tendenza a raccogliere aneddoti anche sui familiari dei poeti (figli, mogli, amanti), nonché forse alla sua propensione ad umanizzare il mito (Eracle, come già fece Dicearco, è descritto come mortale) per fare in qualche modo risalire a lui il frammento di ipotesi che propone l'interessantissimo nome di Cresfonte come autore del poemetto.

⁵³ L'indeterminatezza dell' ἔντοι dell'ipotesi al *Reso* e del τίνας dell'ipotesi ambrosiana potrebbe nascondere o un giudizio, rispettivamente, di Dicearco e di Ieronimo, o qualche notizia da essi riportata. Diversamente Pfeiffer (1968) 242 e n. 3.

⁵⁴ Cf. Martini (1905) 547: Dicearco ebbe il suo floruit ad Atene attorno al 310 a. C. Ieronimo poteva aver conosciuto Dicearco e le sue opere molto facilmente.

⁵⁵ Cf. Matelli in questo volume.

⁵⁶ Per il quale è lecito il dubbio se si tratti di un figlio di Esiodo (cf. n. 36 e 37) o di Eracle (in relazione a *Schol. Dem.* 18.274 Κρεσφόντην] Ἡρακλέους υἱός).

5. Ieronimo γραμματικός a Rodi

Cerchiamo adesso di inquadrare l'attività di Ieronimo, in base a quanto detto prima, sulla scia dei suoi maestri ad Atene e predecessori a Rodi. Ad Atene Ieronimo dovette prendere l'avvio per quelli che dovettero essere gli ambiti primari dei suoi studi. Qui, oltre alle naturali tendenze aristoteliche e dei filosofi del peripato, dovette giovare anche delle nuove esperienze critico-letterarie di Dicearco. Poi giunse il periodo rodiense. E qui assai significativa dovette essere la presenza di Prassifane. Non per caso si dice che questi fu il primo ad essere definito γραμματικός (fr. 8–10 Wehrli).⁵⁷ Il fr. 10 Wehrli (Clem. *Strom.* 1.16.79.3) recita:

Ἀπολλόδωρος δὲ ὁ Κυμαῖος <τοῦ γραμματικοῦ ἀντί> τοῦ κριτικοῦ εἰσηγήσατο τοῦνομα καὶ γραμματικὸς προσηγορεύθη, ἔνιοι δὲ Ἑρατοσθένη τὸν Κυρηναῖον φασιν, ἐπειδὴ ἐξέδωκεν οὗτος βιβλία δύο γραμματικὰ ἐπιγράψας. ὠνομάσθη δὲ γραμματικός, ὥς νῦν ὀνομάζομεν, πρῶτος Πραξιφάνης Διονυσοφάνους Μιτυληναῖος.

Per capire cosa significhi in questo caso γραμματικός ci serviamo di un commentario all' *Arte Grammatica* di Dionigi Trace (568.34 Hilgard):

Δεῖ δὲ τὸν γραμματικὸν καὶ τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ βιβλία γινώσκειν· εἰσὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς ὁμώνυμα βιβλία ψευδῆ, οἷον ἡ Ἀσπίς Ἡσιόδου καὶ τὰ Θηριακὰ Νικάνδρου· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ Ἀσπίς Ἡσιόδου οὐδὲ τὰ Θηριακὰ Νικάνδρου· ἐτέρων γὰρ εἰσιν ποιητῶν, ἐχρήσαντο δὲ οἱ συγγραφεῖς τῇ ὁμωνυμίᾳ Ἡσιόδου καὶ Νικάνδρου, ἵνα ἄξια κριθῶσιν ἀναγνώσεως. Δεῖ δὲ τὸν γραμματικὸν ταῦτα πάντα καλῶς ἐπίστασθαι, καὶ οὕτως λέγεσθαι καὶ εἶναι γραμματικόν.

Prassifane fece appunto una cosa simile: ritenne spurio il proemio de *Le Opere e i Giorni* di Esiodo (fr. 22a–b Wehrli). Ieronimo, da parte sua, dovette occuparsi del testo dello *Scudo*, verificando come anche questo potesse non essere esiodico e venendosi in questo modo ad inquadrare in una tradizione di studi critico-letterari che, proprio a Rodi, avrebbe per lungo tempo dato buoni frutti.

Negli stessi anni sembra che anche Apollonio Rodio si trovasse nello stesso luogo: Rodi.⁵⁸ Pare significativo che proprio lui venga citato

⁵⁷ Cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 158.

⁵⁸ Cf. i prolegomena A agli *Sch. Ap. Rhod.*: a. Γένος Ἀπολλωνίου [. . .]; b. Ἀπολλωνίου βίος e Pfeiffer (1968) 141–2 e 284.

nell'ipotesi A fra coloro che presero una posizione riguardo l'autenticità dello *Scudo* esiodeo.⁵⁹ L'ambiente peripatetico rodiense poté d'altra parte esercitare diversi influssi sul poeta e la sua attività critica. Il debito, quindi, della critica letteraria e, in senso lato, della filologia alessandrina nei riguardi dell'erudizione peripatetica deve essere considerato ben più grande e complesso di quanto fino a questi ultimi anni non si sia fatto.⁶⁰ Non si dimentichi inoltre che in uno dei due βίοι di Apollonio Rodio si riferisce del successo delle Argonautiche ad Alessandria soltanto dopo la permanenza a Rodi. L'influenza su Apollonio poté quindi esercitarsi anche in ambito di poetica.

In questo ambiente vivacissimo intorno alla metà del III sec. a. C. dovette muoversi Ieronimo, filosofo e, potremmo ormai sospettare, "grammatico" anche lui. Abbiamo infatti qualche elemento per credere che il nostro si poté occupare in specifico almeno di un'opera di Esiodo, lo *Scudo*, a cui successivamente Epafrodito dedicò un commentario completo. Ci sembra lecito almeno proporlo: si affiancherebbe al ritratto consueto che di lui viene tracciato, quello di un curioso letterato e γραμματικός!

Bibliografia

- Bix, E. 1931. "Megakleides (1)," *RE* 15: 124–5.
 Buzio, C. 1938. *Esiodo nel mondo greco sino alla fine dell'età classica* (Milano: Università cattolica del Sacro cuore).
 Carrara, P. 1992. "Dicearco e l'Hypothesis del *Reso*," *ZPE* 90: 35–44.
 De Stefani, E. L. 1904. "Per l'*Epitome Aristotelis de animalibus* di Aristofane di Bisanzio," *SIFC* 12: 421–45.
 ———. 1909. *Etymologicum Gudianum*, vol. 1 (Leipzig: Teubner).
 Gallavotti, C. 1934. "Nuove hypotheseis di drammi euripidei," *RFIC* 61 (n.s. 11): 177–88.
 Gudeman, A. 19233. "Scholien," *RE* 2A: 625–705.
 Haslam, M. W. 1975. "The authenticity of Eripides, *Phoenissae* 1–2 and Sophocles, *Electra* 1," *GRBS* 16: 149–74.
 Kassel, R. 1985. "Hypothesis," in *Σχόλια: Studia . . . D. Holwerda oblata*, ed. W. J. Arets et al. (Groningen: Forsten), 53–9.

⁵⁹ Sull'attività di Apollonio Rodio sui testi esiodei cf. Schwartz (1960) 589–95.

⁶⁰ Cf. Montanari (2002) 411.

- Keydell, W. 1937. "Oppians Gedicht von der Fischerei und Aelians Tiergeschichte," *Hermes* 72: 411–34.
- Kirchoff, A. 1852. "Das Argument zum *Rhesos*," *Philologus* 7: 559–64.
- Körte, A. 1929. "Χαρακτήρ," *Hermes* 64: 69–86.
- Luenzner, F. 1868. *Epaphroditii grammatici quae supersunt* (Dissertation Bonn).
- Luppe, W. 1990. "Dikaiarchos und der *Rhesos*-Prolog," *ZPE* 84: 11–13.
- Maleci, S. 1995. *Il codice Barberinianus Graecus 70 dell' Etymologicon Gudianum* (Roma: Boll. Class. Accad. Lincei, suppl. 15).
- Martano, A. 2002. "Scolii e glosse allo Scudo di Eracle dal Manoscritto Ambrosiano C 222 inf.," *Aevum* 76: 151–200.
- Martini, E. e D. Bassi. 1906. *Catalogus Codicum Graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae* (Milan: Hoepli).
- Montanari, F. 2000. "Demetrius of Phalerum on Literature," in *Demetrius of Phalerum (RUSCH 9)*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf (New Brunswick: Transaction), 391–411.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Oxford University).
- Raddatz. 1916. "Hypotheseis," *RE* 9: 414–24.
- Ranke, C. F. 1840. *Hesiodi quod fertur Scutum Herculis ex recognitione et cum animadversionibus F. A. Wolfii* (Quedlinburg: Huth).
- Russo, C. F. 1965². *Hesiodi Scutum* (Florence: La Nuova Italia).
- Rusten, J. 1982. "Dicaearchus and the *Tales from Euripides*," *GRBS* 23: 357–75.
- Rzach, A. 1902. *Hesiodi Carmina* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Scholfield, A. F. 1959. *Aelian on the Characteristics of Animals*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University).
- Schultz, H. 1910. "Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der Hesiod-Scholien," *Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, phil.-hist. Klasse, 12/4: viii–101.
- Schwartz, J. 1960. *Pseudo-Hesiodeia: recherches sur la composition, la diffusion et la disparition ancienne d'oeuvres attribuées à Hésiode* (Leiden: Brill).
- Slater, W. J. 1986. *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta* (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter).

- Sturz, F. G. 1818. *Etymologicum Graecae linguae Gudianum* (Leipzig: Weigel).
- Tuilier, A. 1983. "Nouvelles remarques sur le *Rhésos* d'Euripide," *Sileno* 9: 11–20.
- Wehrli, F. 1969a. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 9: *Phainias von Eresos, Chamaileon, Praxiphanes* (Basel & Stuttgart: Schwabe).
- . 1969b. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 10: *Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler* (Basel & Stuttgart: Schwabe).
- Wellmann, M. 1891a. "Sostratos, ein Beitrag zur Quellenanalyse des Aelian," *Hermes* 26: 321–50.
- . 1891b. "Alexander von Myndos: 1) Alexander als Zoologe; Die Fragmente Alexanders; 2) Alexander als Paradoxograph," *Hermes* 26: 481–566.
- . 1895. "Leonidas von Bysanz und Demostratos," *Hermes* 30: 161–76.
- . 1896. "Aegyptische," *Hermes* 31: 221–53.
- . 1916. "Pamphilos," *Hermes* 51: 1–64.
- Wendel, C. 1935. *Scholia in Apollonii Rhodii vetera* (Berlin: Weidmann).

Appendix of Visual Material

The five photographs that appear on the immediately following pages are printed with the permission of the Antikesammlung, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz.

Page 476: Funerary inscription and relief for Hieronymus, son of Simylinus of Tlos — referred to above on pages 98, 99, 219, 290, and 337.

Page 477: Detail (far left) of the Hieronymus relief — referred to above on pages 291 and 337.

Page 478: Detail (left middle) of the Hieronymus relief — referred to above on page 292.

Page 479: Detail (right middle) of the Hieronymus relief — referred to above on page 292.

Page 480: Detail (far right) of the Hieronymus relief — referred to above on page 293.



Funerary inscription and relief for Hieronymus, son Simylinus of Tlos



Detail (far left) of the Hieronymus relief



Detail (left middle) of the Hieronymus relief



Detail (right middle) of the Hieronymus relief



Detail (far right) of the Hieronymus relief

Index of Ancient Sources for Chapters 3–12

AELIANUS, CLAUDIUS		ANTIGONUS CARYSTIUS	
<i>De natura animalium</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
6.1	462	23 Dorandi	281 n.10
<i>Varia historia</i>		24	281 n.10
3.5	300 n.48	26	280 n.5
AENEAS TACTICUS		ANTIPHANES	
<i>Poliorcetica</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
10.10	326 n.31	341 Kock	416 n.14
AESCHINES		APOLLONIUS RHODIUS	
<i>In Timarchum</i>		<i>Argonautica</i>	
1.11	320	4.604	307
12	325 n.29	APULEIUS	
AESCHYLUS		<i>Apologia</i>	
<i>Fragmenta</i>		36	462
T 78.5c Radt	307 n.85	APOPHTHEGMATA PARISINA	
68–73a	307 n.85	f. 148 ^v v.2	399 n.51
AETIUS		ARISTION	
<i>Placita philosophorum</i>		<i>FGrH 509</i>	
1.7.7	377 n.5	ARISTO CEUS	
4.13.7	359	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
ALCIDAMAS		15 SOD = 31 Wehrli	278 n.2
<i>De sophistis</i>		18 SFOD = 12 Wehrli	309 n.94
8	445	23–4 SOD = 28–30 Wehrli	278 n.2
12	445	25 SOD = 32 Wehrli	278 n.2
15.30–49	445	ARISTOPHANES	
ALCINOUS		<i>Ecclesiazusae</i>	
<i>Didascalus</i>		985	418 n.23
4	384 n.14	<i>Thesmophoriazusae</i>	
ALEXANDER APHRODISIENSIS		33	452
<i>De anima</i>		160	452
70.2	381 n.11	ARISTOPHANES BYZANTIUS	
127–47	355 n.2	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
150.34–5	397 n.19	406 Slater	458 n.9
<i>In Aristotelis Analytica priora</i>		ARISTOTELES	
34.15	385	<i>Analytica priora</i>	
ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA		2.23 68b36	386
6.171		<i>Analytica posteriora</i>	
		1.2 71b19ff.	385

482 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

2.19 99b34–100b5	379	<i>Historia animalium</i>	
2.19 100b7ff.	385	5.19 551a13–27	295 n.27
3.4	404 n.33	<i>De motu animalium</i>	
3.7	404 n.33	7 701a29ff.	381
<i>Topica</i>		<i>De generatione animalium</i>	
1.4 101b21	338 n.9	1.18 724a1	391 n.5
2.6 112b23–5	393 n.12	1.20 727b35	391 n.5
3.2 117a33	397	<i>Metaphysica</i>	
<i>De anima</i>		1.1 980a27–981a30	380
1.1 403a18	391 n.5	1.1 981a4	380
1.1 403a30–1	403 n.34	1.1 981a7ff.	380
2.6 418a12	384	<i>Ethica Nicomachea</i>	
2.7 418b15	355 n.1	1.2 1094a18–24	394 n.13
2.7 418b24	386	1.7	390
2.7 419a12–13, 26–31	363	1.7 1097b1–5	397
2.7 419a15	363	1.8 1099a24–31	394
2.8	369 n.18	1.9–10	398 n.22
2.10 422a11–16	357–9	1.10	390
2.10 422a15	355 n.1	1.10 1100b30–3	392
2.12 424a29	365	1.10 1100b33–1101a8	392
2.12 424a30	365	1.10 1101a6–13	398 n.22
3.3 427b12	384	2	391
3.3 428a11, b28	384	2.3 1104b4–13	391
3.3 428b13	381 n.11	2.5 1105b22	391 n.5
3.3 429a3	383	3.4 1113a33	420 n. 30
3.5 430a14	383	4.5	403 n.33
3.5 430b29	384	4.5 1126a25–6	397, 405 n.38
3.7 431a14	381	4.8 1128a31	433
3.7 431a16	381	4.8 1128a34–5	433
3.8 432a8	381	4.8 1128b1	433
3.10 433a9	381	5.10 1137b29–32	420 n. 30
3.10 433b29	381	7.6	403 n.33, 407 n.43
3.11 434a7	381	7.13	390, 400
3.11 434a8	381	7.13 1153b9–17	394
<i>De sensu</i>		7.13 1153b9–14	400
2 438a25–b2	355 n.1	10.5 1176a15–29	391 n.7
2 438b24	371 n.25	10.8	390
3 440a15–20	355 n.1	<i>Ethica Eudemia</i>	
5 442b29–443a2	356	3.3	403 n.33
5 443a7	356	<i>Politica</i>	
6 446b8	343	5.3 1302b21–33	444 n.5
<i>De memoria</i>		5.5 1304b27–31	444 n.5
1 449b30ff.	381	8.5 1340a15	391 n.7
1 450a2ff.	382	<i>Rhetorica</i>	
2 453a16	397	1.1 1354a26	420
<i>De insomniis</i>		1.1 1354b20–5	446
1 459a18	381 n.11	1.2 1356b26–7	378 n.9

2	403 n.3	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
2.2 1378a30–2	403 n.34	103–11 Rose	464 n.31
2.2 1378a32–3	428 n. 62	103–4	438 n.94
2.2 1379a15	397	106–8	438 n.94
2.4 1381b15	397	110–11	438 n.94
2.4 1382a12–13	428 n. 62	667	316 n.3
2.8 1386a33	446	[ARISTOTELES]	
2.9 1386b9–14	428 n. 62	<i>De coloribus</i>	
2.9 1386b12	428 n. 62	793b12–794a2	359, 269 n.16
2.9 1387a31	429 n. 62	793b12–13	358
2.21 1394b7–1395a2	424 n. 44	794a19–22	369 n.16
2.21 1394b7–16	429	<i>De audilibus</i>	
3.1 1403b20–4a8	445	800a3–8	369 n.18
3.1 1403b26–8	447	<i>Problemata</i>	
3.1 1403b33–4	419	11.58	372 n.28
3.1 1404a2	445	12	370
3.1 1404a16	418 n. 26	12.1 906a23–9	358
3.5 1407b11–12	449	12.2 906a30–5	364
3.7 1408b7–8	447	12.2 906a30–4	358
3.8	308 n.91	12.2 906a33	370
3.9 1409a30–5	450	12.9 907a24–8	358, 364
3.9 1409a35	449	12.9 907a25–6	370
3.12 1410a20–1	444 n.2	12.9 907a25	370
3.12 1413b1–5	445	15.6, 7, 12	372 n.28
3.12 1413b3–5	445 n.8	25.9	372 n.28
3.12 1413b8–31	418 26	28.8 950a18–21	433 n.76
3.12 1413b10–11	454	31.7	372 n.29
3.12 1413b15	449 n.19	31.8	372 n.28
3.12 1413b18	450	31.11	372 n.29
3.12 1413b19–28	438	31.15–16	372 n.29
3.12 1413b19–21	449	31.19–21	372 n.29
3.12 1413b19	438	31.25	372 n.29
3.12 1413b27	438 n.92	<i>Magna Moralia</i>	
3.12 1413b29–34	438	1.22	403 n.33
3.12 1414a8	452	ARISTOXENOS	
3.12 1414a15	427 n.59	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
3.12 1414a18	452	31 Wehrli	310 n.99
3.16 1417a15–27	436 n.87	47–68	308 n.89
<i>Poetica</i>		ARIUS DIDYMUS	
5 1449a35–40	452	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
6 1450b17–18	452	16 Diels	381 n.11, 383, 385
13 1452b36–1453a1	428 n. 62	ATHENAEUS	
14 1453b1–6	452	Deipnosophistae	
14 1453b4–6	454	4 168A	318 n.9
19 1456b8–10	455 n.25	4 168A–B	318 n.9
26 1462a11–18	454	4 184B–C	341 n.83

484 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

5 186A–D	280 n.8	2.16	395
12 512A	458 n.7	4	385
12 547D–548B	336 n.64	4.8	385 n.17
15 696A–B	316	5	389, 390
		5.9–11	411
BION		5.12–13	411
<i>Fragmenta</i>		5.12	411
T 3 Kindstrand	330 nn.46, 47, 334 n.58	5.13	283 n.19, 389, 411, 412, 412 n.3
4	330 n.46, 334 n.58	5.13–14	411
		5.14	395, 411, 412 n.3
CAELIUS AURELIANUS		5.16	400 n.26
<i>De morbis acutis</i>		5.18	397 n.19, 401
1.14 105–6 Drabkin	368 n.14	<i>De legibus</i>	
CALLIMACHUS		1.32	395 n.14
<i>Aitia</i>		<i>Orator</i>	
fr. 1.1–12	302	55	455 n.26
fr. 1.31–6	309	56	448 n.15
<i>Epigrammata</i>		60	455 n.26
23	310 n.99	<i>De oratore</i>	
<i>Fragmenta</i>		1.104	285 n.31
398	310 n.99	3.221	452 n.21
468	310 n.99	3.223–4	455 n.26
532	310 n.99	3.213	448 n.15
CHAMAELEON		<i>Ad Quintum fratrem</i>	
<i>Fragmenta</i>		1.25	327 n.35
9–12 Wehrli	464 n.33	<i>Timaetus</i>	
CICERO		1	286 n.32
<i>Academica</i>		<i>Tusculanae disputationes</i>	
2.113	383	2	395
2.131	395	3	391
2.138	401, 401 n.27	3.76–8	393 n.10
<i>Ad Atticum</i>		3.76	391
6.1.12	415	3.83	395
<i>Brutus</i>		4.18	398
142	448 n.15	4.21	407
250	286 n.32	CLEARCHUS	
<i>De divinatione</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
2.2	395	37–62 Wehrli	308 n.89
3	395	CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS	
4.18	395	<i>Stromata</i>	
<i>De finibus</i>		1.16 79.3	471
1–2	395	2.4 13.2–4	387 n.20
2	395, 398	2.21 127.4–5	396
2.8	399	2.21 128.5	391 n.3
2.9	400	2.21 129.10	391 n.3

2.22 133.4	397	DIAGENES LAERTIUS	
5.3 17	322 n.20	<i>Vitae philosophorum</i>	
[CLEMENS]		1.21	384
<i>Recognitiones</i>		2.11	324 n.26
8.15	369 n.17	2.89	394
CODICES		2.98	394
<i>Vaticanus Graecus</i>		2.132	352
743	428 n.60	2.141	329 n.43
CRATERUS		3.25–6	351
<i>FGrH</i> 342	301 n.53	3.41	322 n.21
		3.109	303
DEMOSTHENES		4.6	322 n.21, 415, 415 n.10
<i>Orationes</i>		4.10	335 n.62
4.18	316	4.11	322 n.21
DEMETRIUS PHALEREUS		4.19	322 n.21
<i>Fragmenta</i>		4.22	408
1.111–26 SOD	414	4.23	300 n.46
43A	280	4.24	283, 284 n.26
80	304	4.32	284 n.26, 300 n.46
134–9	308 n.92	4.39	322 n.21
134	445 n.8	4.40–2	300 n.48
DEMETRIUS RHETOR		4.41–2	297
<i>De elocutione</i>		4.41	337 n.67, 376
137	433	4.42–5	298
139	433	4.42	298
142	433	4.44	332 n.53
152	433	4.49	330 n.46
193	450	4.53	330 nn.46, 47, 334 n.58
DICAEARCHUS		4.63	283
<i>Fragmenta</i>		5.9	316
33–52 Mirhady	308 n.89, 470	5.13	363
40–2	309	5.17–21	414
67	470	5.19	431 n.71
71	470	5.23	403 n.3
99–102	470	5.26	280 n.8
101	468 n.44	5.29	387
112–15	470	5.37	317 n.4, 332 n.53
113	468 n.44	5.38	317 n.7
115A	468 n.44	5.39–40	414
DIODORUS SICULUS		5.39	415, 415 nn. 9, 13
<i>Bibliotheca historica</i>		5.44	280 n.8
1.2.5–6	328	5.51	352
5.55	303 n.60	5.52	333 n.57
20.80–100	444	5.53	278

486 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

5.58	299, 329 n.43	20	448
5.62	278, 298	37.4	449 n.18
5.63	280	40.15	448
5.64	277, 352	40.57	448
5.65–74	278	44.4	449 n.18
5.65–6	414	46.12	449 n.18
5.65	298, 298 n.42, 415 nn.9, 10	<i>Isocrates</i>	
5.66	332 n.53	3.23–6	449
5.67–8	298	12	454
5.67	296, 298, 298 n.41	<i>Thucydides</i>	
5.68	299	50	451
5.69	352, 425 n.46	DIONYSIUS THRAX	
5.82–3	414	<i>Ars Grammatica</i>	
5.86	280 n.9	568.34	471
7.2	401 n.28		
7.4	393 n.10	EPAPHRODITUS GRAMMATICUS	
7.6	353	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
7.10–12	353	51 Luenzner	464
7.13	329 n.43	52	459
7.112	398	EPICURUS	
7.127–8	398	<i>Ad Herodotum</i>	
7.129	335 n.62	52–3	366 n.7
7.130	403 n.32	66	393
7.166	393 n.10	<i>Ad Menoeceum</i>	
7.167	393 n.10	125	397
7.168–9	318 n.9	127	398
7.168	281 n.10	<i>Sententiae Vaticanae</i>	
7.169	329 n.43	79	398
7.178	281 n.10, 393 n.10	81	393
7.179	281 n.10	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
7.180	393	361b Usener	377 n.5
7.184	283 n.22	EPIPHANIUS	
9.54	329 n.44	<i>Adversus haereses</i>	
9.84	361	3.34	303
10.6–7	280	ERGIAS RHODIUS	
10.9	353	<i>FGrH 513</i>	305 n.76
10.16–21	334 n.57	ETYMOLOGICUM GUIDANUM	
10.19	332 n.53	91.17 De Stafani	459, 460–1
10.136	393	EUDEMUS RHODIUS	
DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSENSIS		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
<i>De Compositione</i>		5–6 Wehrli	303 n.63
19	449	5	303 n.62
21.8	449 n.18	6	303 n.64
21.22	449 n.18	125	462
<i>Demosthenes</i>		126–32	463 n.26
17–20	448	150	309
18	448	<i>FGrH 524</i>	305 n.76

EURIPIDES		GELLIUS, AULUS	
<i>Bacchae</i>		<i>Noctes Atticae</i>	
621	406 n.41	13.5.1–12	303
<i>Phaethon</i>		GNOMOLOGIUM VATICANUM	
fr. 771–86 Nauck	307 n.85	no. 144	430 n.66
EUSEBIUS		no. 164	428 n.60, 430, 430 n.65
<i>Praeparatio evangelica</i>		no. 165	427, 428 n.60, 430 n.65
14.7.1	332 n.53	no. 403	430 n.65
15.2.6	317 n.6		
EUSTATHIUS		HELLANICUS	
<i>In Iliadem</i>		<i>FGrH</i> 4 F 114	309 n.93
925.51	283 n.18	HERACLIDES CRETICUS	
		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
FLORILEGIUM MONACENSE		1 Pfister	284 n.23, 329 n.45
no. 173 p. 280.14–16		HERACLIDES PONTICUS	
Meineke	427 n.57	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
		3 Wehrli	366 n.8
GAIUS		45	308 n.89
<i>Digesta</i>		76–7	368 n.13
47.22.4	317 n.7	82	371 n.25
GALENUS		83–6	368 n.13
<i>De constitutione artis medicae</i>		90	368 n.13
7 1.249 Kühn	367 n.12	118–20	367
<i>De differentiis pulsuum</i>		121	367
4.2 8.714 Kühn	367 n.12	122a–b	367, 368, 368 n.13, 371 n.25
<i>De elementis ex Hippocrate</i>			
1.3 1.500 Kühn	367 n.12	HERMIPPUS	
<i>De morborum differentiis</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
6.840 Kühn	367 n.12	37 Wehrli = 77 <i>FGrH</i> 1026	310 n.99
<i>De naturalibus facultatibus</i>		51 Wehrli = 35 <i>FGrH</i> 1026	280 n.9
1.13 2.39 Kühn	367 n.12	57 Wehrli = 74 <i>FGrH</i> 1026	280 n.9
1.14 2.56	367 n.12	HIERON	
1.16 2.67	367 n.12	<i>FGrH</i> 518	305 nn.75, 76
<i>De optima doctrina</i>		HIERONYMUS RHODIUS	
4 1.49–50 Kühn	384 n.14	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
4 1.49	387 n.20	1A White	303
5 1.52	378 n.9	2	289–96, 336–9
<i>De tremore</i>		4	297, 300 n.48, 337 n.67, 376
6 7.615 Kühn	371 n.25	5	298
<i>In Hippocratis Epidemiarum libros</i>		6	298, 377
17.1 506 Kühn	367 n.12	10	358, 360, 363–6, 368, 370, 372
[GALENUS]		11–36	307
<i>Introductio seu medicus</i>		11	389, 395
9 14.698 Kühn	367 n.12	12	390, 396
		13A	395

488 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

13B	395,401	53A–C	308
14	395	54	308, 375, 377
15	395 n. 15, 396, 397 n. 17	55	308,376
16A	395	57A–B	299
16B	395	58	309
16D	395	59A	307
18A	395, 399–400	59C	307
18B	395	60A	305
18C	371, 395	60B	305
19	395	61A–B	308 n.88
20A	395	61A	309
20B	395	HIERONYMUS STRIDONENSIS	
23	371,402	<i>Apologia contra Rufinum</i>	
24	401	3.39	424 n.44
25–7	463 n.27	HISTORIA ALEXANDRI MAGNI	
25	403, 404nn.35, 36, 406	16.11	310 n.99
26	403, 406, 407	HOMERUS	
27	405	<i>Ilias</i>	
28–9	464 n.34	1.248–9	418 n.24
28	280 n. 8, 309	<i>Odyssea</i>	
29	280 n. 8, 308, 309, 464	1.381 = 18.410 = 20.268	406 n.41
30	309	13.437	452
31	308	14.51	451
32	308	HYMNI HOMERICI	
33	308, 309	5.218–38	309 n.95
34	308, 309, 377	HYPOTHESIS A AD <i>SCUTUM</i>	457, 465, 466,
35	308, 367, 371		467
36A–C	308	HYPOTHESIS AD EURIPIDIS <i>RHESUM</i>	466, 467
37A	308, 446		
37B	308	INSCRIPTIONES	
38A–B	298 n.42, 308, 444, 446–54	<i>GVI</i>	
39	308, 309	1451	290 n.2
40	308	<i>IG</i>	
41	308, 309, 462 n.20	II ² 791	333 n.56
42A–C	309	II ² 1006.19f.	283 n.22
42A	462 n.20	II ² 1361.17–20	280 n.7
43A–C	308	XI.4 167	331 n.51
44A–B	309	XI.4 613	331 n.51, 332 n.52
45	308, 459–63	XII 1 141	295 n.30, 309
46A–B	309	XII.1 766.288	337 n.67
47–8	308	XII.6.1 128.18–23	341 n.82
47	309	XII.6.1 128	282 n.16, 319,
49	308, 309		331 n.51
50	309, 367, 371	<i>ILamp.</i>	
51	308	8.1–4	326 n.31
52	308		

<i>ILind.</i>		12.18–20	329 n.44
2 B 65	305	12.26–32	321 n.17
2 D 26–59	305	12.27–8	321 n.17
2 D 39–40	307	12.29	446 n.9
2 D 87–8	305	12.33	329 n.44
88	337 n.67	12.38	446 n.12
644	296 n.31	12.136	446 n.12
647	290 n.5	12.200	338 n.17
<i>IOlymp.</i>		13.7–8	321 n.17
243	353	13.8	450
<i>IPerg.</i>		13.9	450
201	353	13.22	450
202	353	15.9	446 n.11
<i>IRhod.</i>		15.46–7	451
11 Maiuri	326 n.33	15.46	446 n.11
<i>SIG</i> ³		15.141	446 n.12
252.42	332 n.52	15.184	450
461	331 n.51, 332 n.52	15.261–9	321 n.17
577	327 n.34	15.265–8	321 n.17
578	327 n.34		
666	352	LIBER IUBILAEORUM	
672	327 n.34	fr. n. (4.18 Denis)	310 n.99
ISOCRATES		LONGINUS	
<i>Epistulae</i>		<i>De sublimitate</i>	
1.9	453 n.22	12.3–4	451 n.20
8.7	446 n.11, 453 n.22	30.2	452
12.9–10	453 n.22	38	453
<i>Orationes</i>		LYCO TROADENSIS	
1.17	450	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
2.7	450	1 SFOD	278, 281, 282, 283, 284 n.26,
2.22–32	448		285 n.29, 296, 298, 299,
4.8	452		332 n.53, 392 n.8, 413–22, 423,
5.11	446 n.11		424, 425 n.46, 428 n.60, 431
5.26–7	450	4	278–9, 280, 298
5.27	451	5	333 n.56
5.81–2	453	6	282, 331 n.51, 332 n.52
5.81	446 n.11	7	282, 284, 413, 424 n.45, 431–3
5.85	446 n.11	8	279, 281, 336 n.64, 417 n.19, 438
		9	391, 411
5.155	446 n.12	10	390, 391, 392 n.8, 411
8.9	446 n.9	11	283, 389, 411, 423
8.75	446 n.9	12	413, 418, 434–9
12.1	446 n.11	13	412
12.2	453 n.22	14	412
12.10	446 n.11	15	412, 462
12.12	446 n.9	16–21	413

490 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

16	283, 335 n.61, 425 n.51, 428 n.60, 430–1	PAUSANIUS <i>Graeciae descriptio</i>	
17	283, 427–9, 430 n.65	1.18.8	351
18	430, 431 n.72	6.17.7	351
19	283, 425–7	8.44.5	353
20	283, 424–5	10.8.7	351
21	423, 425, 428 n.60	10.30.5	337 n.70
22	429 n.64	PHILO JUDAEUS	
23	414 n.6, 433 n.77	<i>De ebrietate</i> 18–90	361
MESOMEDES		PHILODEMUS	
<i>Hymnus in Nemesis</i>	295	<i>Rhetorica</i> 164–5 Sudhaus	453 n.23
MYRON OF PRIENE		<i>Academicorum historia</i>	
<i>Fragmenta</i>		col. 18.34–40 Dorandi	284 n.26
4–5 FGrH	106	col. 24–5	283 n.22
106 F 4–5 FGrH	305 n.76	col. 35.8–15	286 n.33
NEPOS, CORNELIUS		<i>De Epicuro</i>	
<i>Atticus</i>		fr. 6 col. 2.9–12 (p. 59 Vogliano)	325 n.29
13.3	454		
NICANDER		PLATO	
<i>Theriaca</i>		<i>Apologia</i>	
760	295 n.27	23A7	421 n.34
		23C8	421 n.34
ORIGEN		31D–32A	322 n.20
<i>Contra Celsum</i>		<i>Axiochus</i>	
8.51	398	366D–367A	324 n.29
ORPHICA		<i>Euthydemus</i>	
<i>Hymni</i>		305B	449 n.16
61	295	<i>Gorgias</i>	
71.4–8	296 n.30	448C	380
		455A2–7	427
PAMPHILUS		484C5–D2	321 n.17
<i>Heliadae</i>		485D1–4	321 n.17
fr. 51 TrGF 1.189–90	307 n.85	<i>Hippias minor</i>	
PAPYRI		295B6	397 n.18
<i>Herculanensis</i>		<i>Meno</i>	
1073 fr. 15b.21	449 n.17	76C9	371 n.26
1232 fr. 8 col. 1.7–9	334 n.57	<i>Parmenides</i>	
<i>Halensis</i>		127C	310 n.99
1.260–1	326 n.31	128A	310 n.99
<i>Oxyrhyncus</i>		<i>Phaedrus</i>	
1800	302 n.57	259	309 n.93
3656	376	274B–278C	445
<i>Pack</i> ²		275A	445
1754 col.3.25	387	275D–E	445

Index of Ancient Sources for Chapters 3–12 491

277E	445	722A	371 n.23
<i>Philebus</i>		731C	366 n.6
44	402 n.29	732E	366 n.6
<i>Politicus</i>		744D	366 n.6
289E	330 n.47	746C–F	366 n.6
<i>Protagoras</i>		748B	366 n.6
312B	321 n.17	<i>De Stoicorum repugnantiiis</i>	
337C	393	1033B–C	402
<i>Respublica</i>		1033E	352
465B1	282 n.17	1040C–F	399 n.24
494E	295	<i>Adversus Colotem</i>	
498b	283 n.20	34 1127 C	335 n.61
539B	377	<i>Vitae</i>	
569A7	397 n.18	<i>Antonius</i>	
590B7	397 n.18	58.9	326 n.33
<i>Sophista</i>		<i>Cicero</i>	
224B	330 n.47	24	286 n.32
<i>Symposium</i>		<i>Cleomenes</i>	
222D6–12	436	2	329 n.43, 335 n.61
<i>Theaetetus</i>		<i>Philopoemen</i>	
172D–177B	321 n.17	1.3–4	329 n.42
<i>Timaeus</i>		4.6–8	328, 328 n.40
43B–C	397	<i>Pyrrhus</i>	
56D4–5	367 n.11	34	301 n.49
56E4–5	367 n.11	<i>Solon</i>	
57B2	367 n.11	22.3	318 n.9
72C–D	404 n.35	[PLUTARCHUS]	
PLINIUS SECUNDUS, GAIUS		<i>Vitae decem oratorum</i>	
<i>Naturalis historia</i>		6 838D	351
33.83	351	6 839B	351
34.41	297 n.38	6 840D	330 n.46
34.63	297 n.37	6 843C–E	352
PLUTARCHUS		6 847A	353
<i>Moralia</i>		6 847D–E	352
<i>Consolatio ad Apollonium</i>		6 847D	352
119C–D	300 n.48	POLYBIUS	
<i>De cohibenda ira</i>		<i>Historiae</i>	
454E–F	406	3.102.1	391 n.16
454F	403	4.18.10	431 n.69
458D	406 n.41	5.93.8	285 n.28
460C	403	31.31.1–3	327 n.34
<i>Quaestiones convivales</i>		POLYZELUS RHIDIUS	
626A–B	363	<i>FGrH</i> 521	305 nn.75, 76
633B	433 n.76	POMPONIUS MELA	
719D	366 n.6	<i>De Chorographia</i>	
		1.71	353

492 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

PORPHYRIUS		2.12–17	435 n.81, 436
<i>Vita Pythagorae</i>		2.12–15	437
1.42 (p. 39.18–19; 39.19–20;		2.12	435
39.21 Nauck)	424	2.15	435 n.81
POSIDONIUS		2.17	436
<i>Fragmenta</i>		2.18–20	436
187 Kidd	402 n.30	2.20–2	435, 435 n.82, 436, 437
PRAXIPHANES		2.22	435
<i>Fragmenta</i>		2.24–31	437
1 Wehrli	303, 303 n.65	2.24–9	438
2	303, 303 n.65	2.25	435 n.82
6	303, 303 n.65	2.29	435
8–10	471	2.31	431
10	303	2.33–4	436 n.84
15	303		
19	303	SCHOLIA	
22a–b	471	<i>In Callimachi Aetia</i>	
22a	303	1.1–12	302
22b	303	<i>In Demosthenis orationes</i>	
PRISCIANUS LYDUS		18.274	470 n.56
<i>Solutiones</i>		<i>In Hesiodi Scutum e Codice Ambrosiano</i>	
59.22	381 n.11	C 222 inf.	
PROCLUS		hyp.	465
<i>In Hesiodi Opera et Dies</i>	303	schol. 301	463
<i>In Platonis Timaeum</i>		schol. 430–31	458–9
1.5c	303	<i>Vetera in Hesiodi Scutum (ed. Ranke)</i>	
		School. Ad v. 301	464 n.30
QUINTILIANUS		<i>In Homeri Iliadem</i>	
<i>Institutio oratoria</i>		20.170	462 n.20
2.5.6	449 n.8	<i>In Homeri Odyssea</i>	
		9.5–6	393 n.12
RUTILIUS LUPUS		SENECA	
<i>De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis</i>		<i>Epistulae Morales</i>	
1.6	434	92.6	397 n.19, 402 n.30
1.7	438	<i>De ira</i>	
1.7.1–3	438 n.92	1.19.3	405
1.7.6–8	438 n.92	1.19.4	406
1.21	434	SEXTUS EMPIRICUS	
2.2–4	434	<i>Adversus mathematicos</i>	
2.4–6	437	3.3	467
2.7–8	436	7.27–262	378
2.7	434	7.35	384
2.8	435	7.143	384 n.15
2.9–11	437	7.217–26	378 n.8
2.9–10	436	7.217–18	378, 379, 383
2.10	435	7.218–25	379

7.218	380	STRABO	
7.219	381 n.11	<i>Geographica</i>	
7.221	379, 381, 382	13.4.2	326 n.33
7.222	380, 381	14.2.5	297 n.36, 301 n.55
7.226	379, 383, 384	14.2.7	303 n.60
<i>Pyrrhoniae hypotyposes</i>		14.2.8	306
2.16	384	STRATO	
3.32–3	367 n.12	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
STOICORUM VETERUM FRAGMENTA		44 Wehrli	369 n.17
1.559	322 n.20	45	369 n.17
2.107	384	47–8	369 n.17
3.23–4	399 n.24	50	369 n.20
3.49	398	88	364 n.3
3.103	393 n.11	111	364 n.3
3.106–8	396 n.16	113	359, 359 n.6
3.111	393 n.11		
3.394–5	403 n.33	TELES	
3.395–8	404 n.36, 406 n.42	<i>Diatribae</i>	
3.397–8	403 n.33	21 Hense	323 n.24
3.412	398	23	323 n.24
3.414	398	29–30	324 n.26
3.415	398	40	336 n.64
3.431–4	393 n.12	46	336 n.64
3.474	398	50	324 n.29
3.687	403 n.32	TESTAMENTA XII PATRIARCHORUM	
3.702	402	3.13.2 De Jone	310 n.99
3.738	335 n.62	THEMISTIUS	
SOPHOCLES		<i>Orationes</i>	
<i>Oedipus Coloneus</i>		23.285	280 n.8
1050–3	296 n.30	THEOPHRASTUS	
<i>Trachiniae</i>		<i>De causis plantarum</i>	
557	452	5.7.3	295 n.27
STOBAEUS		6.1.1	356
<i>Anthologium</i>		6.17.1	357, 364
1.49 p. 383.8–11 Wachsmuth	396	<i>Characteres</i>	
1.58 p. 497.15–25	385	7.7	424
2.7.3c p. 47.7–11	394 n.13	<i>Historia plantarum</i>	
2.7.3c p. 47.17–20	397 n.19	2.4.4	295 n.27
2.7.3c p. 77.1–5	394 n.13	4.2.2	364 n.3
2.7.18 p. 130.18–21	396 n.16	<i>De igne</i>	
2.7.20 p. 141.10	420 n.30	75	369 n.16
2.17.19 p. 134.8–19	396 n.16	<i>De lapidibus</i>	
2.31.27 p. 206.26–9	335 n.62	49	369 n.16
2.31.124 p. 240.2–4	335 n.61	67	369 n.16
2.31.124 p. 240.6–7	336 n.64	<i>De odoribus</i>	
		45	364

494 Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes

50	364	692	418 n.2
<i>De sensibus</i>		698–704	308 n.91
7	368 n.13	712	447, 448, 455
9	368 n.13	713	452 n.21
11	364 n.2	719A	447
14–15	368 n.13	[TIMAEUS LOCUS]	
<i>Fragmenta</i>		<i>De natura mundi et animae</i>	
1.33–8 FHS&G	415	87–8	295
1.34–8	415 n.11	TIMOCRITUS	
1.36–7	415 n.13	<i>FGrH</i> 522	305 n.76
1.38	415 n.9	TZETZES	
1.41–5	414, 414 n.8	<i>In Hesiodi Opera</i>	303
1.236	308 n.92	<i>Vita Hesiodi</i>	466 n.38
8	303 n.62		
12	280 n.9	VITAE	
18.6	304 n.70	<i>Aeschines</i>	
23	280 n.9	3.3–5	334 n.57
31	433 n.76	<i>Aesopus</i>	
36	280 n.8	22–4	334 n.57
90A	385, 386	<i>Apollonius Rhodius</i>	471 n.58
112B–C	386	1, 2	302 n.59
157	303 n.64	<i>Aristoteles (V. Marciana)</i>	
293	455	41–2	316 n.3
301A	378 n.8	VITRUVIUS	
436 no. 5	403 n.33	<i>De architectura</i>	
449A	420 n.30	6 praef. 1	330 n.47, 335, 335 n.60
465	336 n.64		
486	416 n.15	XENOPHON	
487	413 n.4	<i>Memorabilia</i>	
511	378	2.1.21–34	393 n.12, 402
569–579B	464 n.32		
569–570	438 n.94	ZENO RHODIUS	
572–6	438 n.94	<i>FGrH</i> 523	307 n.84